

SEP 12 1947

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

AP

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

JULY 1947

Price 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

ARTICLES

Christian Beginnings (A Reply to Dr. Barnes's 'The Rise of Christianity'), by Professor C. H. Dodd, M.A., D.D., S.T.D.

Facing Difficulties within the Church, by Maldwyn Edwards, M.A., Ph.D.

The Significance of Thomas Coke, by Cyril J. Davey.

Shades of Feuerbach, by E. C. Urwin, M.A., B.D.

Theology: The Modern Protestant Approach, by Robert A. Nelson.

The Priest and the Siren, by W. S. Handley Jones.

Medicine and the Ministry, by T. W. Bevan.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

Matthew's Logia: An Essay in Deduction, by F. J. Brown, C.B., C.B.E., M.A., B.Sc.

The Perennial Philosophy (Aldous Huxley in Search of his Soul), by J. Henry Bodgener.

Methodism in Hiroshima, by Leslie R. Earnshaw.

The Church of the Future, by W. H. Baker.

RECENT LITERATURE, Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

FROM MY NEW SHELF, by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

LONDON
EPWORTH PRESS
EDGAR C BARTON
25 · 35 · CITY ROAD · E.C.1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller and from all Methodist ministers at 2s. 6d. a copy (postage 3d.) or 10s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

The *good* men do lives after them

The National Children's Home has enough evidence to prove that Shakespeare was right when he made Mark Antony say that "the evil men do lives after them". But it has plenty of proof that the contrary is also true.

The beneficent influence of hundreds of friends lives on because they remembered the Children's Home in their wills. An earnest appeal is made to all who can to follow their fine example. No other memorial is so permanent or so far-reaching in its effects.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

CHIEF OFFICES HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N. 5



Our Contributors

PROFESSOR C. H. DODD
M.A., D.D., S.T.D.

Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity Cambridge since 1935. Author of *The Authority of the Bible, Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon* (Abingdon Commentary), *The Parables of the Kingdom, The Present Task in New Testament Studies, How to Read the Gospels, etc., etc.*

MALDWYN EDWARDS
M.A., PH.D.

Secretary Methodist Temperance and Social Welfare Department. Author of *John Wesley and the 18th Century, After Wesley, Methodism and England, This Methodism, and One Increasing Purpose.*

MYRL J. DAVEY

Methodist Minister. Missionary in India. Reviewer and contributor to several periodicals. Author of *He Wanted the World.*

G. URWIN
M.A., B.D.

General Secretary Methodist Temperance and Social Welfare Department. Author of *Religion in Planned Society, The Way of a Christian Citizen, Methodism and Sobriety, etc., etc.*

ROBERT A. NELSON

Methodist Minister (Irish Conference); Missionary in Ceylon for several years. Author of *Is there a Theological Basis for Reunion?* Regular contributor to theological journals.

F. S. HANDLEY JONES

Methodist Minister; poet, essayist, literary critic. Author of *The Unveiling and Other Poems, It Crossed My Mind.*

W. BEVAN

Methodist Minister, whose special interests are Literature and Social Questions. Author of *Fireside Philosophy, etc.*

J. BROWN
C.B., C.B.E., M.A., B.SC.

London University prizeman in New Testament, Greek and Christian Evidences. Director of the International Telegraph Companies Association. Author of *Cable and Wireless Communications of the World* and other technical works. Contributor of articles on New Testament sources and the Patristics.

HENRY BODGENER
M.A.

Methodist Minister. Author of *Life of the Spirit in Modern Man; Love, Courtship, and Marriage; The Child with the Strange Hands; A Man Praying.*

HELEN R. EARNSHAW

Chaplain to the Forces. Recently returned from service in Japan.

H. BAKER

Methodist Minister. Contributor to *Expository Times* and other Reviews.

Editorial Comments

THE BICENTENARY OF DR. THOMAS COKE

ON 9th October 1747, Thomas Coke was born at Brecon. His father was an apothecary, who became chief magistrate of the town, and a man of sufficient means to send his son to Oxford and to provide him with a private income. When Thomas completed his course at Oxford, he returned home, became a magistrate and a somewhat juvenile Doctor of Civil Law. He had been ordained deacon in 1770 and priest in 1772, and presently became curate at South Petherton. It seemed as though this scholarly young man would now settle down as a parish priest in Somerset. He has been described, somewhat tersely, as 'a Welshman, short-necked, short-bodied, big-brained, and originally an avid High Churchman'. However permanent the racial, physical, and intellectual qualities may have been, his theological outlook changed rapidly. This was due to two factors—the influence of Thomas Maxfield, the first Methodist lay-preacher, later ordained by an Irish bishop, and the reading of Wesley's *Sermons*. After a visit to London he returned to his parish, his mind and heart ablaze. His flaming evangelism was resented and some of his parishioners drowned his voice with the ceaseless clang of bells as he preached.

His first contact with John Wesley is recorded in the entry for 13th August 1776 in the *Journal*: 'Here I found a clergyman, Dr. Coke, late Gentleman Commoner of Jesus College, Oxford.' The importance of that meeting for the future of Methodism and of world-wide Christianity has not always been realized. History has many instances of complementary partnerships in the discovery and dissemination of Truth. Kepler's Laws of Motion depended on the strange but providential association of two very different personalities.

The Danish noble, Tycho Brahe, was physically a remarkably strong man, able to endure hard weather and long periods of concentrated observation. He gathered a vast amount of material as he watched with his primitive instruments the changing heavens, but he was no theorist. The data he gathered held secrets he could not discover. Young Kepler, the weakling, left the inn where he was pot-boy, to join the old astronomer, and to derive from his mass of data the famous laws which were a priceless heritage to the scientists who followed him. The combination of accurate observer and brilliant theorist had achieved what neither could have accomplished separately.

In the case of Wesley and Coke there was a partnership which has not been sufficiently recognized. Whilst Wesley had an amazing variety of gifts, his work was extended and amplified by the imagination of Thomas Coke. His vision reached to America, to India, and the islands of the sea. No one would forget Wesley's words, 'The world is my parish', but there is an even greater saying, 'the field is the world', and the Celtic imagination of the lad from Brecon leaped over sea and land to the uttermost parts of the earth. Nazareth, Judea, Samaria—these had been but incidental beginnings to his Lord. 'The fields were white unto harvest', and there were no boundaries to the fields.

It was significant, too, that Thomas Coke should come into Wesley's circle at so critical a time. Methodism had stabilized its theology and its polity,

but it had not yet determined the limits of its mission. In Dr. Fitchett's words it was to decide whether it was to be 'parochial or imperial'. There were obstacles in the way of expansion. Not the least of these was that Wesley's ideas of America were still governed by his experiences in 1735. Even after Francis Asbury had become responsible for the work in the New World, there were endless complications caused by the Revolution and the birth throes of the infant republic. It was fortunate indeed that Thomas Coke was not only able, but willing, even eager, to act as liaison officer between the English Conference and the new American Methodism. Eighteen times he crossed the Atlantic, at his own expense, and with all his fervent zeal brought a sense of responsible judgement to the new problems. On the whole Coke proved an admirable ambassador. His mistakes were few, and he resisted temptations to assume power to which lesser men would have succumbed.

The vexed question of the ordination of Coke by Wesley, and of Asbury by Coke is of academic interest, but the grace mediated through Asbury to the people of America and through Coke to Methodism overseas and in Ireland can never be questioned. It has been said that for many years Thomas Coke became virtually 'the perpetual President of the Irish Conference'.

On the death of John Wesley he was Secretary of Conference in England, and in 1797 was elected President. It is not, however, by virtue of any office that he will be remembered. He did much to shape the policy of the missionary enterprise of early Methodism. His legal knowledge was invaluable in co-operating with Clulow the lawyer, in drawing up the momentous Deed of Declaration in 1784. His generous spirit and his deep humility counteracted what has been too readily described as his 'rashness'. One might almost say the rashness was transformed into intelligent and adventurous zeal. It was two months before, after much patient and prayerful consideration, he agreed to John Wesley's proposal to ordain him 'Superintendent' and only then because he had come to a definite conclusion as to the abstract lawfulness of the measure which had been propounded. His interview with George Washington on the question of negro slavery so impressed the General that he accepted and treasured a copy of Coke's sermons preached at the Christmas Conference at Baltimore in 1784. Though many Methodists in England criticized his support of the loyal address to Washington and the new republic, and still more his views on separation from the Church of England, none could doubt his passionate sincerity. He was in truth an 'apostle' whose work was sealed by the blessing of God. For two centuries it has endured, and today its influence is felt in the four corners of the earth.

It is seemly, on the occasion of this bicentenary, to recall the noble words of Dr. Charles Little in the tribute he paid to Coke and Asbury at the Centennial of the Christmas Conference in 1884:

How different were the men who fell into each other's arms at Barratt's Chapel on November 14, 1784—Thomas Coke, the only child of a wealthy house, and Francis Asbury, the only son of an English gardener! The one an Oxford graduate; the other the self-taught scholar of a frontier world. Coke, impulsive, fluent, rhetorical; Asbury, reticent, pithy, of few words, but mighty in speech when stirred by a great theme, a great occasion, or the inrushings of the Holy Spirit. Coke's mind was as mobile as his character was stable. Asbury's conclusions matured of themselves, and,

once formed, were as steadfast as his love for Christ. Coke could never separate himself wholly from England; Asbury could never separate himself from America. Coke crossed the Atlantic eighteen times; Asbury never crossed it but once. . . . Coke founded missions in the West Indies, in Africa, in Asia, in England, in Wales, in Ireland; Asbury took one continent for his own, and left the imprint of his colossal nature upon every community within its borders. Coke was rich, and gave generously of his abundance; out of poverty Asbury supported his aged parents. . . . Coke was twice married; Asbury refused to bind a woman to his life of sacrifice. . . . Both were loved; both were at times misunderstood. . . . Neither shrank from danger or from hardships. . . . Coke lies buried beneath the waves he crossed so often; but around the tomb of Asbury beat continually the surges of an ever-increasing human life, whose endless agitations shall feel, until the end of time, the shapings of his invisible, immortal hand.

In an hour when the future of the world depends so much on right relationships between the people of the United States of America and the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations our minds go back to the apostolic ministries of these two men. To the members of the Church they helped to make strong there has come a heritage, a trust, and a privilege. It may be that in this time of crisis the qualities which they pooled may become effective in their successors, for today, as yesterday, 'the field is the world'.

BEYOND THE SCORE-BOARD

In the Pavilion at Lord's there is a drawing of the All England XI of a hundred years ago. The artist was Nicholas Wanoostrocht, whose cricketer's pseudonym was Felix. Perhaps the outstanding figure in the picture is William Clarke, the bowler whose record of 476 wickets in a season remains unbeaten. We are grateful to Mr. G. D. Martineau for a recent article in the *Spectator*, in which he reminded us of this astonishing personality. It was Clarke, a Nottingham bricklayer, who first led an All England XI on to the Hyde Park Ground, Sheffield, in 1846. He was nearly fifty years of age, had only one eye, and had been playing for Notts since 1816, yet he accomplished a cricketing revolution. Though his action was criticized he persisted in his policy. Fixtures were arranged against teams, sometimes consisting of twenty-two players. In seven seasons (1847-53) Clarke took an average of 340 wickets per year though in 1882 he was handicapped by a broken arm.

There is something dour and indomitable about the old bowler, studying his opponents at practice and marking each particular weakness. It is not so much his original methods nor his amazing record which moves one to admiration as the memory of the cricket tours which he arranged and which brought his stalwarts to places where small boys watched eagerly, until their spirits fell beneath the spell of the masters. It was Mr. Martineau who reminded us, not only of William Clarke, but of a little boy, six years of age, who watched and wondered. His mother had taken him to Bristol to see twenty-two of West Gloucestershire play the All England XI. No one dreamed that little William Gilbert Grace would become the greatest cricketer of all. Perhaps it was the challenge of the old bowler taking his eighteen wickets which thrilled

the child that day and made his fingers ache for the feel of a bat. How much did W.G. owe to the old veteran? So many of us remember W.G., so few have heard of William Clarke, but that is the way of the world. The brilliant pupil is often the teacher's only reward.

In writing to his opponent Hooke, Sir Isaac Newton, more generous than most, said: 'If I have seen farther, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants.' The world which remembers Newton has forgotten those from whom he learnt the alphabet and the first figures.

Old James Veitch, the ploughwright of Jedburgh, offered a sturdy pair of shoulders to little Davie Brewster, the schoolmaster's son. It was in his shop the boy learnt much of higher mathematics from this self-taught philosopher, astronomer, and mathematician. The founder of the British Association, Sir David Brewster, is remembered, but Jamie Veitch is almost forgotten.

The world would not have been enriched by the life and work of Sir James Simpson, had not his six brothers worked long hours in the bakehouse, so that the youngest of the family might go to college. Moreover, it was old Timmerleg, the cripple, who first taught him in the village school.

Back in the Pavilion at Lord's one looks at William Clarke in his grey top-hat, and seems to see W.G. and all the great host who followed him, acknowledging their debt. In the laboratories where men learn to handle new and incalculable forces is it Timmerleg and James Veitch who stand with the Newtons and the Brewsters and the Simpsons watching anxiously how men handle their legacy? We who have inherited so much are but trustees in our turn. Even cricket may teach men to forswear another Hiroshima!

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Liberal League of Youth recently held a conference on Principles and Moral Standards in Politics at which many distinguished speakers delivered addresses non-partisan in character and all based on the assumption that we are living in a time of 'spiritual crisis'. The basic principles underlying politics must, eventually, be in accordance with those that religion and morality establish. The main purpose of the demonstration was 'to encourage young people of all parties and of no party, to a greater sense of personal responsibility and a deeper realization of the need for a spiritual basis for political thought'. We agree with Sir Alfred Suenson-Taylor, who presided, when he said: 'For half a century the ideals upon which our Western Christian civilization has been built have been undermined and with this undermining of faith in Christian ideals, moral standards are falling, for moral standards cannot stand on their own.' He maintained that a civilization based on humanistic ideas, however well-planned, is bound to collapse in disaster. The speakers included Dr. Edward Carpenter, Miss Mary O'Connor, Mr. Elliott Dodds, Commander Stephen King-Hall, and Father Paul Crane. In his address on 'Christian Principles in Industrial Relationships' Father Crane stressed the immediate need to recover the sense of proportion which has been missing for

so long from our industrial life. We are privileged to record the following extract from his speech:

The relations between the members of an industrial group are in harmony or out of it according as the members of the group—(a) recognize its basic purpose, i.e. the essential relationship of its efforts to the needs of human nature; and (b) have the will and the courage to play their part in co-operating to achieve it. It follows that we cannot discover the relationship, which should hold between the members of industrial society until we know the purpose of that society. Since *all* society is composed of individuals, we must know something of individual purpose if we are to know the basic purpose of society in general (and industrial society in particular) and so discover the relationship which should exist between those engaged in joint industrial effort.

Assuming, as I must, the double fact of God's existence and man's creation by God, I might say that man's purpose in life is fine living, the full development of his personality through the appropriate use of those powers which are basically his as a human being and which he has in common with all other men. For the normal man, a decent standard of living is necessary for the adequate development of his personality. Man is made up of body and soul, not separated and compartmented, but blended to form one person and interacting constantly on each other. Because of his interaction inadequate social conditions break, not only a man's body, but also his spirit and so impede that full development of his personality, that fine living, to which he has a right as a human being. Hence man's right to a decent sufficiency must be seen as a means to the fulfilment of that right to fine living, which he has as a human being.

The root purpose of industrial society stands defined, quite logically, as the securing of an adequate standard of living for all those who are partners to it. Its first charge is the welfare of all those who take part in it. The basic purpose of all social life is the fuller development of human personality. The specific purpose of industrial society is subsidiary to this—a decent sufficiency for all as a means to the fuller development of personality.

In the past this fundamental purpose of industrial society was not recognized in Great Britain. The objective morality of Christendom was set aside by an extreme form of irresponsible individualism. The purpose of industrial society was considered to be the enrichment of those whose wealth and acquisitiveness were sufficient to push them along in it. The result was the crushing of the poor by an irresponsible, profit-seeking minority. Wealth was piled up but it was not equitably shared. Relations in industry too often degenerated into a master-slave status and the only two moral principles, which the English, who had money, pushed up at this time to consolidate their position were those of respect for property and observance of contract. Both are sound. Neither should remain, as they did remain during this period, unqualified and prostituted to the service of profit-getting.

The tendency now is to swing away from laissez-faire and monopoly capitalism in the direction of increased control by the State over the industrial machine.

Supposing greater efficiency and a more equitable distribution of wealth were secured under a system of totalitarian control, would we be right to accept both in return for the suppression of individual initiative and responsibility? The basic purpose of society is the fuller development of those who are partners to it. Those who are partners to it are born free and responsible. So, therefore, they *must* act and a decent sufficiency is sought as a means to the fuller development of a *free and responsible* person. To secure this sufficiency at the *price* of individual freedom and responsibility is to invert the whole order of society and to strike at the basic purpose of social life.

The sufficiency to which men have a right must be secured by the free, responsible efforts of free men and women. Otherwise its achievement loses all sense and the country, which achieves it at this price, turns into a cattle-run. There you have the fundamental principle which should govern industrial relations.

Having indicated the basic Christian principle, which should govern industrial relations, it is clear that its expression is through the responsible, co-operative efforts of free men. It is obvious that the forms it should take in industry are along the lines of co-partnership, profit-sharing, joint consultation, and joint management.

There can be no doubt as to the value of such demonstrations. Youth is entrusted with the responsibility of the franchise, and it needs to be taught to think for itself, lest it be overwhelmed by what is merely party propaganda.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Articles

CHRISTIAN BEGINNINGS

THE Bishop of Birmingham has essayed a sketch of the formative period of the Christian religion, set upon a large historical background.¹ His survey begins with 'a sequence of changes, in some group of higher apes, which gradually led to the formation of a group or groups of sub-men'. It ends with a rapid glance at the fortunes of the Christian religion after the state establishment of the Church under Constantine. Dr. Barnes paints on his large canvas with a skilful hand. He has lucidity and grace of style. A bland irony often gives an agreeably sub-acid tone to his writing.

'I have sought', says the Bishop in his preface, 'with firm impartiality to reach the truth, so far as it can be ascertained.' Exact impartiality—easy enough, perhaps, in those abstract fields of study in which the distinguished author first made his great reputation—demands severe effort from the historian, and the effort may lead to some over-compensation. A Christian scholar, for instance, conscious of a rooted respect and affection for the apostles and evangelists of his faith, may strive to correct his bias, and in doing so may overshoot the mark. Dr. Barnes esteems them well this side idolatry. Their thought, he warns us, was 'shaped by the growing intellectual deterioration of the time'. The Gospel according to Mark is 'an honest compilation made by an earnest and credulous man'. If the Apocalypse is 'fantastic', the Epistle to the Hebrews is 'hardly less extravagant'. Paul is 'vehement, sometimes unfair, and, it must be added, sometimes unintelligible' (p. 233). His epistles are marred by 'strange arguments and irrational beliefs' (p. 235). His theology 'may border on the absurd' (p. 234). His teaching in Galatians (and elsewhere) 'is, of course, repellent to the modern Christian humanist' (p. 235, cf. p. 233).

The Modern Christian Humanist is a leading character in this book. Like Paul's 'spiritual man', he judgeth all things and is judged of no man. It might

¹ *The Rise of Christianity*, by E. W. Barnes, Sc.D., D.D., LL.D., F.R.S., Bishop of Birmingham. Longmans, Green & Co.

be supposed that the approval or disapproval of this worthy is of no great moment to a strictly historical investigation. I should not, certainly, uphold the view which denies to the historian, in all circumstances, the right to pass judgements of value; but the task of relating and distinguishing judgements of value and judgements upon matters of fact is a delicate one. I cannot think it legitimate to argue that this or that passage is untrue, or spurious, or a 'late insertion', *because* its contents do not commend themselves to the Modern Christian Humanist. Arguments of this kind are too common in the book before us.

The value of any attempt at historical reconstruction must depend, in the first place, upon sound criticism of the documents, beginning with their chronological arrangement. One school of criticism tends to a somewhat late dating of the New Testament writings: for example, Mark is dated about A.D. 75, Matthew and Luke about 90-100, John in the early second century; Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles are regarded as non-Pauline, and the latter are dated to the early years of the second century; and so on. Other critics prefer dates a decade or more earlier in each case. The evidence is none too clear; differences of opinion are inevitable, and are not likely to disappear soon. Where the majority stands at any given moment on any given question is a point perhaps impossible to settle, and when our author professes to report the view of a 'majority' of critics, he need not be taken too exactly. When, however, he speaks for 'analytical critics', or 'independent scholars', without qualification, he often claims too much.

On the whole, he sides with the school which prefers late dates. But his judgements are frequently more extreme than those of typical representatives of the school. Thus, while many critics, as I have said, date Mark about 75, by arguments which carry weight (though I do not think they are decisive against the arguments for an earlier date), our author will have it ten years later, without tangible reason given. The Lucan history (Third Gospel and Acts) he dates, with many critics, about 100, chiefly on the ground of its apparent dependence on Josephus; but he believes it to have been extensively interpolated during the second century. The nativity stories of Matthew and Luke, he says, were harmonized at a late date (their 'harmony' has not struck most students with any force), and he adds, 'such skilful removals of contradictions may often be suspected in the New Testament; they probably were effected during the second century of our era, while the New Testament was being formed, and possibly within the years 140-75' (p. 72).

It is however in dealing with the Pauline epistles that his 'analytical criticism' becomes completely airborne. He not only rejects Ephesians and the Pastorals, dating the latter thirty or forty years later than is customary, but he holds that the nine so-called 'genuine' epistles in large part 'faithfully reflect the changing thought of fairly representative Christians during the last half of the first century' (p. 223). Galatians he is prepared to accept as substantially Pauline, with 'much' of 2 Corinthians, though he takes the latter (with many critics) to be a compilation of various Pauline fragments. Every other epistle he believes to have been interpolated to an extent which we cannot precisely define, but which is in any case considerable. The scholars on whose authority he here relies, he does not name, nor can they be identified from the scrappy

bibliography. Possibly they may have adduced reasons for the eccentric views they adopt. Dr. Barnes adduces none of any weight.

Thus, a large part of the Epistle to the Romans (not precisely determined), which contains what has usually been thought the characteristically Pauline teaching about Law and Sin, is written off, because 'some scholars have surmised that such teaching . . . cannot have come from a Jew carefully brought up in the traditions of his people. It must be due, they think, to some man of primitive mentality, whose speculations with regard to social conduct were as confused as those of an untaught adolescent grappling with a fundamental philosophical problem' (p. 234). Whether Paul wrote Romans 6¹⁻¹⁴ 'may perhaps be doubted', on the ground that its doctrine of Baptism is profoundly influenced by 'some oriental mystery faith' (p. 238; similarly, p. 278).

The First Epistle to the Corinthians appears to be a hotchpotch of Pauline material and 'late insertions'. Chapter VII contains references to ascetic practices which 'could hardly have arisen at the very beginning of the spread of the Christian faith'. Chapter X, which contains what are elegantly described as 'sacramental babblings', must be late because it implies 'a somewhat prolonged influence of pagan cults on Christian worship'. The account of the institution of the Eucharist in Chapter XI is attributed to 'some Christian late in the first century'. Again, 'we may well doubt Paul's authorship of the "Praise of Love"' in Chapter XIII. The phrase 'though I give my body to be burned' may recall the end of the adventurer Peregrinus, about A.D. 165. Chapter XV is a tract on the resurrection by 'some early second-century Christian apologist' (pp. 226-30). One can only marvel at such confident assurance about what Christians did *not* believe or practise at a period from which (it appears) hardly any authentic documents have come down to us. Need I heap up examples? This is not criticism. It is a travesty of criticism.

I shall return to the subject of New Testament criticism in a moment; but meanwhile let us complete our survey of this part of Dr. Barnes's book by looking at his treatment of the Apostolic Fathers. Here again the latest possible date is usually chosen in each case. Clement is dated to A.D. 125 instead of the more usual 96: no tangible reason assigned. The Ignatian epistles are regarded as a fabrication of the middle second century. The reasons given are, briefly, that they contain a creed and presuppose a body of orthodox doctrine, that they attack heresy of a Gnostic type, and that they assume the threefold ministry, and emphasize the authority of the bishop. The argument assumes that we already know, independently, the stages of ecclesiastical development in the provinces of Asia Minor. We do not. Until the Ignatian letters are dated, there is a large gap in the anyhow scanty evidence. To the best of my belief, it is not in general true that 'opinion during the present century has hardened against the belief that the Ignatian correspondence is genuine' (p. 262).

There is one notable exception to this customary preference for late dates. The *Didaché*, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, is dated to the late first century. To be precise, the 'earliest draft' is 'not later than A.D. 95', and the tract as a whole is taken to give a 'picture of normal Church life some sixty or seventy years after the crucifixion of Jesus' (p. 247). This view is not universally held. In recent years there has been a strong tendency, shared by

scholars of great distinction and supported by formidable evidence, to place it in the late second century, or even in the third. Dr. Barnes speaks of 'attempts to discredit its reliability and to disparage its witness', but such attempts, he holds, 'must be adjudged to have failed'. It is, I think, too soon to say they have failed, though for my own part I still believe, with Dr. Barnes, that there is much to be said for an early date. But why is he so militant in defence of this rather uninspiring work? 'The *Didaché* is a presentation of Christianity which appeals especially to the modern Christian humanist.' This handsome testimonial has a reason. One of the recurrent themes of Dr. Barnes's book is the contention that the sacramental element in Christianity is no original part of 'the noble religion of Jesus the Christ', but a relic of primitive magic which came in from the mystery religions. It would be difficult to maintain this theory if the account of the institution of the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians 11²³⁻⁶ were taken at its face value, but this, as we have seen, is discredited as a later insertion, as are also the corresponding passages in the Synoptic Gospels. The *Didaché*, however, contains a series of eucharistic prayers which do not allude to the sacrificial death of Christ, or to the communion of His body. Clearly, then, the *Didaché* must be more primitive than 1 Corinthians 11—in spite of the fact that the evidence regarding the *Didaché* is equivocal, while there is no evidence at all for the excision of 1 Corinthians 11²³⁻⁶.

The happy-go-lucky methods of documentary criticism which we have noted rest upon the supposition that there was a period in the second century—the period 140-75 is mentioned—when the whole literary tradition was completely fluid. This in turn is connected with a misconception which Dr. Barnes appears to share with many amateurs confronted with the complexities of textual criticism: the misconception, namely, that the history of the text of the New Testament is so uncertain that it is anybody's guess. It is of course true that we have nowhere the text as it left the hands of the writers—and perhaps never shall have it. It is true also (as our author is fond of emphasizing) that our earliest manuscripts are of the fourth century, apart from some fragments. The term 'fragments', however, may mislead the uninstructed reader. The 'fragments' include, for example, the great Chester-Beatty papyrus of the early third century, which contains nearly the whole of nine epistles. But our knowledge of the history of the text does not depend solely on manuscripts of the New Testament. It is derived from the consentient witness of manuscripts, early versions (Syriac, Latin, and Coptic), and quotations in ancient writers. Upon the basis of such evidence, by the exercise of patience, exact observation, and critical acumen, reputable scholars have established the existence, and the character, of various regional texts—Alexandrine, Syrian, 'Western', and so forth—which lie behind all subsequent revisions. These texts, it is held, upon sufficient evidence, took shape before the middle of the second century. Their differences, though they are numerous and characteristic, are seldom significant historically or doctrinally. That in the earliest period of all the text of writings destined to form part of the New Testament was treated in a more free and easy fashion than later became customary, is likely enough, and indeed the variants point that way; but they certainly do not suggest any such deliberate and far-reaching manipulation as Dr. Barnes postulates. It is of course open to anyone to conjecture the existence of divergent texts

which have disappeared without leaving a trace, and in the nature of the case it is impossible to prove a negative. Conjecture, directed by a trained intuition, and used with discretion, may be admitted when it introduces an hypothesis seeking verification; but the kind of conjecture we have here has no place in responsible criticism.

After this treatment of the documents, it is not surprising that the beginnings of Christianity fade into a mist of uncertainty. There is nothing to get hold of. If you try to build upon a piece of evidence, as likely as not it turns out to be spurious, or a late insertion, or repellent to the Modern Christian Humanist. Ixion is left embracing a cloud. The Acts and the Pauline epistles having disintegrated in our hands, the history of the Apostolic Age is reduced to guess-work. The Gospel narrative fares no better. It may be taken as fact that Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate, but most of the Passion-narrative is pious fiction, nor can we feel much more confidence about the events of the Ministry.

We encounter here the difficulty of the miracle-stories with which the Gospels abound. A miracle is, of course, an offence to the Modern Christian Humanist. His fundamental dogma is 'the postulate of the large-scale, or finite-scale, uniformity of nature' (pp. vii *et passim*). (The scientist of fifty years ago, with his robust faith, would have said bluntly, 'the uniformity of nature', without haggling over large or finite scales. Will the scientist of fifty years hence think it wise to hedge his dogma with further qualifying clauses?) I do not propose here to argue the question of miracles. I would only say that in dealing with writers of the first or second century (Christian or non-Christian) it is a mistake to assume that the reporting of miraculous occurrences necessarily discredits the witness. Whether or not we accept the objective possibility of such occurrences, we must recognize that miracles belonged to the apparatus through which the early Christians comprehended and expressed their experience of life, just as truly as electrons and waves are part of the apparatus through which the modern physicist comprehends and expresses his experience of the physical world. If we are to understand what they have to say we must allow them to speak to us in their own terms.

Miracles apart, however, I cannot help feeling Dr. Barnes's critical estimates to be sometimes ill-conceived or ill-informed. Thus, he rejects the acclamation of the centurion at the cross (Mark 15³⁹) on the ground that 'the term "son of God" would not have come naturally to the lips' of a pagan soldier. He is mistaken. The expression 'son of God' (υἱος θεοῦ) was familiar among the Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Roman Empire in the first century, as inscriptions on papyri abundantly attest.

He supposes that the author of Hebrews (7³) meant to say that Jesus came into this world without any human parent at all, and sets this over against the stories of His birth. Again, he is mistaken. A few verses lower down (7¹⁴) the author states that 'our Lord sprang from Judah', which unquestionably implies physical descent from that tribe, and consequently a human birth. The true meaning of 7³ cannot be understood without having regard to first-century methods of symbolical or allegorical interpretation of sacred texts, which were common to Christians, Jews, and pagans. The Epistle to the Hebrews is pre-eminently a writing which refuses any impressionistic treatment.

scholars of great distinction and supported by formidable evidence, to place it in the late second century, or even in the third. Dr. Barnes speaks of 'attempts to discredit its reliability and to disparage its witness', but such attempts, he holds, 'must be adjudged to have failed'. It is, I think, too soon to say they have failed, though for my own part I still believe, with Dr. Barnes, that there is much to be said for an early date. But why is he so militant in defence of this rather uninspiring work? 'The *Didaché* is a presentation of Christianity which appeals especially to the modern Christian humanist.' This handsome testimonial has a reason. One of the recurrent themes of Dr. Barnes's book is the contention that the sacramental element in Christianity is no original part of 'the noble religion of Jesus the Christ', but a relic of primitive magic which came in from the mystery religions. It would be difficult to maintain this theory if the account of the institution of the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians 11²³⁻⁶ were taken at its face value, but this, as we have seen, is discredited as a later insertion, as are also the corresponding passages in the Synoptic Gospels. The *Didaché*, however, contains a series of eucharistic prayers which do not allude to the sacrificial death of Christ, or to the communion of His body. Clearly, then, the *Didaché* must be more primitive than 1 Corinthians 11—in spite of the fact that the evidence regarding the *Didaché* is equivocal, while there is no evidence at all for the excision of 1 Corinthians 11²³⁻⁴.

The happy-go-lucky methods of documentary criticism which we have noted rest upon the supposition that there was a period in the second century—the period 140–75 is mentioned—when the whole literary tradition was completely fluid. This in turn is connected with a misconception which Dr. Barnes appears to share with many amateurs confronted with the complexities of textual criticism: the misconception, namely, that the history of the text of the New Testament is so uncertain that it is anybody's guess. It is of course true that we have nowhere the text as it left the hands of the writers—and perhaps never shall have it. It is true also (as our author is fond of emphasizing) that our earliest manuscripts are of the fourth century, apart from some fragments. The term 'fragments', however, may mislead the uninstructed reader. The 'fragments' include, for example, the great Chester-Beatty papyrus of the early third century, which contains nearly the whole of nine epistles. But our knowledge of the history of the text does not depend solely on manuscripts of the New Testament. It is derived from the consentient witness of manuscripts, early versions (Syriac, Latin, and Coptic), and quotations in ancient writers. Upon the basis of such evidence, by the exercise of patience, exact observation, and critical acumen, reputable scholars have established the existence, and the character, of various regional texts—Alexandrine, Syrian, 'Western', and so forth—which lie behind all subsequent revisions. These texts, it is held, upon sufficient evidence, took shape before the middle of the second century. Their differences, though they are numerous and characteristic, are seldom significant historically or doctrinally. That in the earliest period of all the text of writings destined to form part of the New Testament was treated in a more free and easy fashion than later became customary, is likely enough, and indeed the variants point that way; but they certainly do not suggest any such deliberate and far-reaching manipulation as Dr. Barnes postulates. It is of course open to anyone to conjecture the existence of divergent texts

which have disappeared without leaving a trace, and in the nature of the case it is impossible to prove a negative. Conjecture, directed by a trained intuition, and used with discretion, may be admitted when it introduces an hypothesis seeking verification; but the kind of conjecture we have here has no place in responsible criticism.

After this treatment of the documents, it is not surprising that the beginnings of Christianity fade into a mist of uncertainty. There is nothing to get hold of. If you try to build upon a piece of evidence, as likely as not it turns out to be spurious, or a late insertion, or repellent to the Modern Christian Humanist. Ixion is left embracing a cloud. The Acts and the Pauline epistles having disintegrated in our hands, the history of the Apostolic Age is reduced to guess-work. The Gospel narrative fares no better. It may be taken as fact that Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate, but most of the Passion-narrative is pious fiction, nor can we feel much more confidence about the events of the Ministry.

We encounter here the difficulty of the miracle-stories with which the Gospels abound. A miracle is, of course, an offence to the Modern Christian Humanist. His fundamental dogma is 'the postulate of the large-scale, or finite-scale, uniformity of nature' (pp. vii *et passim*). (The scientist of fifty years ago, with his robust faith, would have said bluntly, 'the uniformity of nature', without haggling over large or finite scales. Will the scientist of fifty years hence think it wise to hedge his dogma with further qualifying clauses?) I do not propose here to argue the question of miracles. I would only say that in dealing with writers of the first or second century (Christian or non-Christian) it is a mistake to assume that the reporting of miraculous occurrences necessarily discredits the witness. Whether or not we accept the objective possibility of such occurrences, we must recognize that miracles belonged to the apparatus through which the early Christians comprehended and expressed their experience of life, just as truly as electrons and waves are part of the apparatus through which the modern physicist comprehends and expresses his experience of the physical world. If we are to understand what they have to say we must allow them to speak to us in their own terms.

Miracles apart, however, I cannot help feeling Dr. Barnes's critical estimates to be sometimes ill-conceived or ill-informed. Thus, he rejects the acclamation of the centurion at the cross (Mark 15³⁹) on the ground that 'the term "son of God" would not have come naturally to the lips of a pagan soldier. He is mistaken. The expression 'son of God' (*υἱος θεοῦ*) was familiar among the Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Roman Empire in the first century, as inscriptions on papyri abundantly attest.

He supposes that the author of Hebrews (7³) meant to say that Jesus came into this world without any human parent at all, and sets this over against the stories of His birth. Again, he is mistaken. A few verses lower down (7¹⁴) the author states that 'our Lord sprang from Judah', which unquestionably implies physical descent from that tribe, and consequently a human birth. The true meaning of 7⁸ cannot be understood without having regard to first-century methods of symbolical or allegorical interpretation of sacred texts, which were common to Christians, Jews, and pagans. The Epistle to the Hebrews is pre-eminently a writing which refuses any impressionistic treatment.

Dr. Barnes attaches importance to certain passages in the so-called Apocalypse of Peter, an apocryphon of the second century. It should be said that the passages in question do not occur in our only Greek manuscript (incomplete) of the Apocalypse of Peter. They are found only in an Ethiopic compilation which contains the Apocalypse in question together with other matter. However, waiving this point, we must ask, Does Dr. Barnes really think that this fantastic stuff (which anyone can read in M. R. James's *Apocryphal New Testament*) represents a tradition no less worthy of credence than the Marcan version? I doubt it. Yet the uninstructed reader might be pardoned for supposing that he does, for he writes: 'It was from a mass of such material that the author of the gospel according to Mark shaped his story' (p. 193). This is not the only place where the issue is confused in a similar way.

Once again, it is common ground with the evangelists that Jesus was put to death at Passover-tide, though they differ about the precise day of the month. Dr. Barnes sees fit to question this. Here is his reason: 'Some critical scholars have doubted whether it can have been so early in the spring as the time of passover, inasmuch as at Gethsemane Jesus and his disciples do not seem to have felt the cold, which after nightfall can at this season be unpleasant in the hills near Jerusalem' (p. 159). . . . Comment seems needless.

Space does not admit of further specimens. I must, however, permit myself a few general observations on the subject of method in the historical criticism of the New Testament, because I conceive our author's method to be in one respect fundamentally at fault. The historian of the beginnings of Christianity cannot expect evidence which has the status of *procks-verbal*, or of depositions before the court. He is here at a disadvantage in comparison with the historian of the modern world, though there are wide tracts of ancient time where the historian is no better off. In every piece of evidence, taken by itself, it is possible to find dubious or questionable elements, and one by one they may be set aside. 'Taken by itself' . . . 'one by one': these are the phrases I wish to emphasize, for this is Dr. Barnes's method. He goes through the record piecemeal, and has no difficulty in showing that each separate unit of narrative is in one way or another open to doubt; from which it appears a matter of simple addition to reach the conclusion that the whole story is worthy of little credence. Apart from such instances as those I have cited, where the criticism may seem somewhat captious, the objections raised are often perfectly legitimate—if it be granted that each unit of narrative must justify itself in and by itself. I believe the nature of the evidence calls for a different method.

During the last thirty years much of the most fruitful work has been done by critics who have seen clearly (what the best critics of an earlier period always knew by instinct) that their task is to envisage the early Christian tradition as an organic whole—a living, growing, coherent thing. With this in view, they consider everything in the New Testament worthy of serious and prolonged scrutiny. It may be a story about Jesus, or a precept or parable attributed to Him, or an interpretation of the Old Testament, or an argument in defence of the faith, or a piece of theological or ethical teaching, or a hymn. Each of them must be studied, understood, weighed, as one component in the tradition. In and for itself, the story may have legendary elements, the saying may have suffered modification, or even may be wrongly attributed to Jesus; the argu-

ment may seem unconvincing; the theology may fail to commend itself to the Modern Christian Humanist. Nevertheless each tells us something about the form and content of the tradition. The separate pieces of a jig-saw puzzle may look entirely meaningless, but it is unwise either hastily to discard a piece because you cannot think so queer a shape will fit anywhere, or to trim it to a better shape. Patience will gradually bring the pattern to view.

Thus our aim is the reconstitution of the tradition out of our various materials, and the reassessment of those materials, in turn, in the light of their place in the whole. The picture of early Christianity, which emerges, must be studied upon the background of the environment, both Hebraic and Hellenistic, within which Christianity grew. The whole, and each part, must be reviewed and understood afresh in this context. The labour is long: there is no short cut. But it is proving possible to recognize, by sound argument from definite evidence, those portions of the tradition which are both central and primitive, and from them to work back to a picture of the life and teaching of Jesus which may not have the full detail of a biography, but is essentially historical. Of all the work that has been done along these lines since the almost simultaneous publication, at the end of the Four Years' War, of two famous treatises, by Martin Dibelius and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Dr. Barnes betrays no knowledge.

It would, however, be wrong to leave the impression that the book is entirely destructive in tendency. With Chapter VIII, which deals with 'Jesus and His Teaching', we reach a part of the subject where our author has something positive to communicate to his readers. He believes the report of the teaching of Jesus to be, on the whole, more credible than the narrative of His life—and here he would find much support among critics. It is true that it is only a residue of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the Gospels that he is prepared to accept and use effectively: chiefly those which convey direct ethical instruction. For other sides of the teaching he has less appreciation. To eschatology he is antipathetic. The idea of the Kingdom of God leaves him baffled. 'We can,' he writes, 'in fact, discover no clear or consistent evidence either as to the nature of the kingdom or as to the manner of its coming' (p. 135). The range of material, therefore, with which he deals is limited, but the exposition of the ethical teaching of Jesus, and the picture of His human personality which he draws from the teaching, are so done as to betray an enthusiasm for his subject which is elsewhere concealed.

There is only one other place where, as it seems to me, a similar enthusiasm can be felt, and here it is partly damped by the author's theological inhibitions. He is profoundly attracted by the 'mysticism' of the Fourth Gospel, and the passage in which he both confesses the fact and refuses to go all the way with John's theology has in it something of the pathos of regret. 'The writer's use of the concept of the Logos leads to a profound and emotionally satisfying mysticism. . . . But we have to confess that the Logos doctrine sets us insoluble intellectual puzzles. . . . John, if we comprehend him aright, claims too much' (pp. 95, 97).

In the end the book, taken as a whole, has undeniably, and depressingly, a negative effect. It has been widely praised for its frankness and honesty—deservedly praised. But these are not the only qualities requisite in one who

offers himself as a guide through a peculiarly complex historical problem. He requires accurate information, command of critical method, patience, sobriety of judgement, and the historical imagination which includes the power to enter with sympathy into the minds of men of another age. This last gift above all has been denied to Dr. Barnes. He observes with a detached and curious gaze these beings of the first and second centuries, and marvels at their unaccountable mental antics. It is not that way that understanding comes or knowledge advances.

C. H. DODD

FACING DIFFICULTIES WITHIN THE CHURCH

THE MERE raising of the cry of Church unity will not bring the fulfilment of our hopes. The walls of this city will not fall to any trumpet blast. The difficulties are too formidable to admit of any easy solution—and yet within the fold of those who hold the Catholic conception of the Church differences may be adjusted and likewise those holding the Protestant conception of the Church may compose their differences. But how can the gulf which separates Catholics (whether English, Roman, or Eastern) from Protestants ever be bridged? The issue is between Sacramentalism and Evangelicalism: between Order and Grace. The Catholic regards the Sacraments as the essential means of grace, whilst the Protestant believes that the Grace of God is directly mediated to the believer through his faith. The two positions need not be wholly exclusive. It is possible for the Protestant to regard the Sacraments as essential means of grace and the Catholic may have an evangelical experience. In practice, however, this does not often happen. Ezekiel was a priest and a prophet but he has had few followers. It is easy to understand the reason. If you emphasize the primacy of the Sacraments then the office of the Priest becomes all-important and the validity of his orders must be guaranteed. This can only be done by the episcopal laying-on of hands—and the right of the Bishops to do this can only be maintained by the doctrine of apostolic succession which maintains that by unbroken continuity the Orders have come through the apostles from the Lord Himself. If a Protestant accepted the Catholic teaching of Holy Communion he could not receive the elements at the hands of a Nonconformist Minister. He would need to attend where a priest episcopally ordained was the celebrant and this he could not properly do unless he was confirmed and a communicant. And thus in order to bridge the gulf he would have to cross it. Fully to accept the Catholic position he would have to become a Catholic.

The Report of the Anglican Commission of Christian Doctrine is distinctly Catholic in its tone and interpretation. It condemns the celebration of the Eucharist by anyone except a priest, not on the grounds of irregularity, but of invalidity, and it proceeds therefore to declare that 'Priesthood is one of the appointed conditions actually constituting the Sacrament of the Eucharist'. An important section in the Church and the Ministry laid down that

The Church has been called apostolic primarily in that it preserves the essential tradition of the apostolic preaching and teaching, and maintains, as a safeguard of that tradition, a duly appointed order of ministers who derive their commission in historical succession from the original apostolate. The Church may also be called apostolic as being charged with the Mission to bear witness to Christ and to declare His Gospel before the world. By its apostolicity, therefore, the Church of today is linked to the Church of primitive times through an essential identity of doctrine, a continuity of order, and a fellowship in missionary duty.

The acceptance of any Order of Ministry cannot be based on considerations of evangelistic effectiveness alone, apart from any regard for continuity and unity. The life of the Church is continuous from generation to generation: continuity of ministerial commission embodies in the sphere of order the principle of Apostolicity in the sense of continuous mission from Christ and the Father. . . . The ministers of the Church in all later generations have possessed a pastoral authority as themselves holding commission from the Lord in succession to the Apostles, and the status of ministers in this succession has been guaranteed from one generation to another by a continuously transmitted commission; consequently, to preserve continuity in this respect is at all times of great importance.

Now it is very difficult for Catholics with this doctrine of the Church to come to terms with Protestants. For whilst the Protestant does not deny the value of the Sacrament as an especial means of Grace, he believes that the grace of God may be mediated as richly through other channels. He does not deny the validity of priestly orders but he extends that priesthood to all believers. The minister is honoured because by an inward constraint of the spirit of God he separates himself wholly to the work of the Ministry. He cries out, 'Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel', and his call is confirmed by the call of the Church and by the signs which follow his ministry. But his priesthood in essence is not different from all those who have accepted the divine commission and do the King's business. 'We are not only Kings and the freest of all men,' said Martin Luther, 'but also priests for ever, a dignity far higher than kingship because by that priesthood we are worthy to appear before God, to pray for others, and to teach one another mutually the things which are of God.' In another book he wrote with noble eloquence: 'At the Eucharist we are in our priestly dignity. . . . We do not let the priest proclaim for himself the ordinances of Christ: but he is the mouthpiece of us all and we all say it with him in our hearts with true faith in the Lamb of God who feeds us with His Body and Blood.' And so the Protestant does not make the efficacy of the Sacrament depend upon the validity of the celebrant's Orders, nor does he accept any doctrine of apostolic succession except that tradition of life and witness in the Church which stretches back to the apostles themselves.

If therefore a Protestant finds it hard to discover a basis of union with Catholics it is equally difficult for the Catholics to come to an understanding with Protestants. If a Catholic desired that personal experience which is the evangelical heritage of Protestants he would substitute the authority of his own experience for the authority of the Church which through the Priesthood and the Sacraments mediates God's grace to him. To bridge the gulf he would need to cross it and become in one true respect a Protestant.

It is because Catholics and Protestants have been true to their particular conceptions of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, that the difference between them has appeared so great. The Catholics desire passionately the one visible Church on earth. They desire to see schism and heresy ended. They want to see all the sheep brought into the one fold—and since they believe they are the one true Church it is natural that they should desire a policy not of co-operation but absorption. This may seem intolerant to Protestants but it is actually only consistency of principle. The Protestant view is much more elastic. When the Augsburg Confession defined the Church as 'The congregation of saints in which the Gospel is fairly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered' the conception was that of the fellowship of believers. It was in the old Puritan phrase 'the assembly of the faithful'. The emphasis was not on the fold but on the flock. The Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order (1937) declared: 'We acknowledge that all who accept Jesus Christ as Son of God and their Lord and Saviour, and realize their dependence upon God's mercy revealed in Him, have in that fact a supernatural bond of oneness which subsists in spite of divergences in defining the divine mystery of the Lord.'

In an excellent little book on the Methodist Doctrine of the Church, Edgar Thompson sums up the five working definitions of the Church as

1, *Where is Christ, there is the Church*; 2, *Where is the Spirit, there is the Church*; 3, *Where is the Bishop, there is the Church*; 4, *Where is the Word, there is the Church*; and 5, *Where is the work, there is the Church*.

He rightly concludes that four out of five of these definitions would be accepted by all the Churches as complementary affirmations leading to a complete definition. It is only on the necessity of episcopacy that unanimity would break down. In a word it is on the one question of order that Churches are still divided.

The Protestant view of the Church asserts as a basis of unity its belief that all who confess Jesus as Lord to the Glory of God the Father take their place in the body of Christ which is the Church. But if for the sake of peace and unity a Catholic tried to accept that basis he would have to confess Jesus Christ as the sole mediator between God and man. He would have to deny the need for the intercession of saints. He would have to believe that no priest or pontiff is indispensable for communion with God, and that in a true sense there is a priesthood of all believers. He would be driven to the view so finely expressed by Dr. W. F. Lofthouse that loyalty to Christian faith and conduct is 'a way that has very little to do with orders, that was revealed before the threefold ministry was thought of, and that rises from the immediate assurance of the forgiveness of sins through the redeeming work of the Saviour'.

We dare not then minimize the differences which separate the Catholics from Protestants. The issue between Order and Grace, between Sacramentalism and Evangelicalism can never be smoothed out by soothing words.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century theological interest was centred mainly on Salvation as a personal experience. The middle of the century brought the work of F. D. Maurice, followed by the later Christian Socialists. Then the Kingdom of God became the absorbing topic amongst Christian thinkers. But now in every branch of the Church it is the nature of the Church

which is most freely discussed. On the Continent we have had the writings of Barth, Visser t'Hooft, Père Congar, and in this country the nature of Catholicity as discussed amongst others by Daniel T. Jenkins, the Congregationalist, and Father Hebert, the Anglo-Catholic. It is from that section of Congregationalists most strongly influenced by neo-Calvinism and moving under the shadow of Barth's mighty authority that we are receiving the finest interpretation of Catholicism as understood by Protestants. It is worth remarking that Hebert's 'Form of the Church' is in no sense a counter-blast to the brilliant book of Daniel Jenkins on the *Nature of Catholicity*, but rather a restating of much that is common to them both. Indeed, he does not hesitate to say that many Anglican Catholics have far more living contact and mental sympathy with the neo-Protestant School in the Congregationalist and other Free Churches than with some fellow Anglicans. Father Hebert is making a fair statement on the modern situation when he declares that in the controversy now prevailing there is enthusiastic agreement in most things and cordial disagreement in others. His own statement of the forms which make the Church: Bible, Creeds, Sacraments, and Ministry—would be accepted by all the main branches of the Church except Quakers and Salvation Army, though Congregationalists would not accept the Creeds as an essential form. Most certainly all Christians would agree that Christ is the form of the Church, that the formative influence comes from the Holy Spirit and that consequently Form is not a mould, but very life. Nor would there be any quarrel with Father Hebert's four marks of catholicity. 1, *Extension to Nations*; 2, *Wholeness of the Faith and the due proportion of its parts*; 3, *To draw into unity and sanctify all sorts and conditions of men*; and 4, *Healing of the diseases of the soul*. Mr. Jenkins lists eight marks of catholicity but except in one instance they are all in consonance with Father Hebert's thinking. The one exception is that

a truly Catholic Church will permit nothing in its constitution which hinders it in its obedience to the Word of God. The most obvious and common of these hindrances is State control. There can be no excuse in any circumstances for the Church accepting dictation regarding its distinctly ecclesiastical actions from an entirely different and mundane body such as the State.

But the Church is not only Catholic: it is one, holy, and apostolic. Now in discussing the unity of the Church as resting on the Lord, who is its very ground and substance and in whom the Church is indivisible, Hebert carries us all. We would not share his emphasis on the Mass, but his conviction that Christian unity is realized where there is a common confession of faith, as amongst the German Confessional Christians, and his assertion that to reunite Christendom by amalgamation is starting at the wrong end would be generally accepted. In the same way few would cavil at his statement on the holiness of the Church, and in particular the assertion that sacraments, Scripture reading, and preaching have as their end the consecration of the people. It is a shrewd comment of his that the main vocation of Protestantism is to bear witness to the true relation of means to ends.

In the discussion of unity, holiness, and catholicity, there is not much to divide Mr. Jenkins from Father Hebert. It is rather a difference of method than of principle. Mr. Jenkins brings all under the judgement of the Word,

and Father Hebert speaks under the authority of the Church. But these two different canons of criticism are of major importance. The Protestant submits to the discipline and KRISIS of the Word. When we seek to make sure of our catholicity the only test we can finally use is to stand under the judgement and promises of the Scriptures. It is this criterion apart from any consequences which separate Protestants from Catholics.

The Church is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. It is the interpretation of apostolicity which marks the great rock of stumbling between the two great schools of thought. Hebert, speaking for all Catholics, would make monarchical episcopacy the *esse* of the Church. The theory of apostolic succession is set forth with unambiguous distinctness in the document: *Doctrine in the Church of England*. John Wesley, after reading Lord King's book on the Primitive Church *Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church*, remarked:

In spite of the vehement prejudice of my education, I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draft, but if so, it would follow that Bishops and Presbyters are essentially of one order, and that originally every Christian congregation was a Church independent of all others.

He believed that the theory of apostolic succession neither could be proved nor was highly credible. So much seems obvious to Free Churchmen. Who were the Apostles? Certainly the Twelve, but what shadowy figures some of them were. Have we any sound knowledge of what they did after the Ascension? Some travelled, but did they all? How do we know whether they founded Churches and secured the succession? What of the Seventy sent out by our Lord and the five hundred to whom He appeared after His Death? There was, apart from Paul, James the brother of the Lord, to be ranked in the apostolic company. And as with the apostles, so with bishops, the term has a certain ambiguity. In some Churches bishops may have been appointed by a travelling apostle. In others they would be elected by the congregation. In some Churches there was not one Bishop, but several, and these would be elders, but certainly not Bishops in our sense of the word. In the New Testament there is no fixed hierarchical order of officers in the Church, and no fixed method of appointment of bishops. Hebert, and all who occupy his position, put too much weight on too slender an edifice. There are the three Church offices of Minister, elder and deacon, mentioned in the New Testament, and there are no grounds for claiming one to be essential, and the other two as dependent Ministries.

But it is not the Biblical argument for the theory, nor the historical (more untenable still), which essentially matters. The point is that upon this foundation the apostolicity of the one catholic Church has been given a mechanical interpretation which makes Free Church Ministries irregular. In a true sense those are in the apostolic succession who maintain the same witness to the same Lord, the same Faith, and the same Baptism. To us, it is a presumption not easily to be understood that only those episcopally ordained have orders which are regular and valid.

But the consequence of this position is even more serious. Many would accept episcopacy in some form as the *bene esse* of the Church, but to maintain

it as essential means that 'non-episcopal Protestant Churches' are thereby excluded. It is not for us to point out that Anglican orders are discredited by the Church of Rome. Sufficient it is to say that in any Catholic conception of the Church (whether English, Greek, or Roman) the true unity of the Church is set at nought. The Catholic interpretation of Episcopacy and therefore of Orders is a sharp dividing sword. Either one accepts and comes inside, or one refuses and is veritably an outsider.

Now there is nothing in the New Testament metaphors of the Church to countenance this hard and unyielding view. The Bible picture is of diversity within a glowing unity, a fellowship of those who have the same Lord and are of the same way. In the record of history is the attempt of the medieval Church to bring men into the one ecclesiastical organization. The Reformers had their own exalted conception of the one Church on earth, but in the working-out of historical circumstances, it was not their substitution of one conception for another which was remembered. It was their blow against the existing structural unity of the Church. It will never be possible again to force men into the strait-jacket of one rigid organization. History does not stand still, nor does it turn upon itself. The contemporary situation poses the same question both for nations and the Church. How can the freedom of the individual be reconciled with the good of the whole? There are two extremes to be avoided. If you think too exclusively in terms of the individual there is political and religious anarchy. If you think overmuch about the whole there is totalitarianism in State and Church. Freedom and planning are needed in the State. What of the Church? The Catholic Church gains authority by its very emphasis on the Whole, but in the pride and exclusiveness of its demands it becomes the greatest barrier to that unity of Christendom it so longs to achieve. It denies the march of time.

All of us admire 'the scientific spirit'. In its passion for truth, its inflexible honesty, its integrity of purpose, it is a spirit we all would covet. But the scientific spirit is a very different thing from the so-called 'scientific attitude'. This even in its boasted rationality is hard, dogmatic, and self-righteous. It is not content to work in its own proper sphere, but out of that one-sided aspect of reality to deduce a general philosophy. By all means let scientists be philosophers, but first let them take other aspects of truth than their own into account.

We know in like fashion 'the catholic spirit', and we would fain possess it. But the 'catholic attitude' is a much more hardened and intolerant version of it. It makes its own deductions from inadequate premises and assumes an authority which it has no right to possess. Whilst that attitude persists, Christendom is bound to be divided and to have no organic structure. All of us long for the sheep to know they belong to the one flock because they have the one Shepherd. And if in God's providence we shall be brought in time to the one fold, comprehensive and capacious enough to satisfy our varying needs, so much the better.

But the immediate need of the moment is to be men of 'catholic spirit' in John Wesley's use of that term.

do not mean, embrace by modes of worship; or, I will embrace yours. This is a thing which does not depend either on your choice or mine. We must both act

as each is fully persuaded in his own mind. Hold you fast that which you believe is most acceptable to God, and I will do the same. I believe the Episcopal form of Church Government to be scriptural and apostolical. If you think the Presbyterian or Independent is better, think so still and act accordingly. I believe infants ought to be baptized; and that this may be done either by dipping or sprinkling. If you are otherwise persuaded, be so still, and follow your own persuasion. It appears to me that forms of prayer are of excellent use, particularly in the great congregation. If you judge extemporary prayer to be of more use, act suitable to your own judgment. My sentiment is that I ought not to forbid water, wherein persons may be baptized; and that I ought to eat bread and drink wine as a memorial of my dying Master. However, if you are not convinced of this, act according to the light you have. I have no desire to dispute with you one moment upon any of the preceding heads. Let all these smaller points stand aside. Let them never come into sight. If thine heart is as my heart, if thou lovest God and all mankind, I ask no more. Give me thine hand.

But whilst the Kingdom of God is taken by the violent it is never seized by the impatient. Fretfulness is not a synonym for zeal. We dare to pretend in the world of thought that no barriers exist and we dare not attempt to force on people a solution which they are not ready to accept.

But if in theory we are divided we can still be united in action. There is a great field of enterprise in which we can know our oneness in Christ. And meanwhile the Church in South India is a reminder that if we are of one heart and mind, the fitting form of organization must eventually be realized. Faithfulness is all.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THOMAS COKE

NO MAN IN Methodism had a greater significance for his own age, for Methodism, and for the missionary movement, than Thomas Coke. No man, deserving to be remembered, has been more completely forgotten.

Methodism has been accused, not unjustly, of an incurable Scriptomania. Histories, biographies, assessments of men and movements, statements of belief and experience, have all poured from the Press since John Wesley, himself our most prolific writer and editor, first began his publishing ventures. Our heroes have been immortalized, our eccentrics preserved, and our saints and sinners exhumed and exhibited to posterity. In these circumstances it is almost incredible that only three full-length biographies of Coke have been written. Of these the earlier are forgotten, and Dr. Etheridge's *Life* was published almost a century ago and has been out of print for decades.

Mr. Deaville Walker had accumulated a mass of material for a definitive biography, but he died before more than a few chapters were written. I have tried to fill the gap, in this bicentenary year, with a brief and popular account of his life.¹ There still remains a great need, however, for a worthy study of this brilliant, vigorous pioneer.

¹ *The Man Who Wanted the World* (Cargate Press, 3s. 6d.).

It is as a pioneer that Coke is most significant, though he rendered other services to the Church, and he will be found to have the spirit, the vision and the doggedness, as well as most of the faults, of the pioneer. All these qualities were aggravated by his Welsh temperament and, not seldom, by the stubborn obstinacy of his colleagues and brethren.

His life is too full to be recounted in any detail here.

Born in Brecon, in 1747, he went to Oxford to take his arts degree after he had attended the local college founded by Henry the Eighth. His first year at Oxford was one of mild profligacy and uneasy scepticism, in which he was encouraged by a cynical tutor, but before he left his college he was deeply committed to a pursuit of truth and righteousness. His attitude is not unlike that of the early, rigid, High-Church Wesleys.

He might have had a career in either the Church or the Law. His fellow-townsmen had created him an alderman and elected him chief magistrate before he was twenty-five. There was sufficient money in the family to maintain him until he found his speedy way to recognition and success in either profession. He might, too, have lived a pleasant if less profitable life as a country gentleman. In 1772 he made up his mind about the future and went as a curate to the Somerset town of South Petherton. This was a very second-best choice, for he had relied on the good offices of a gentleman of quality, whom he had helped to win a local election, to introduce him to a prebend at Worcester Cathedral.

The obscurity of Somerset did little to hide his light. The church was quickly crowded, and he even built a gallery at his own expense. The bishops had their eye on him for promotion. The gentry of the parish discovered him an amiable companion and a not-too-tedious whist player. He shared the mob's dislike and the aristocracy's contempt for the dissenters of the town.

Then, he met Wesley's first lay helper, Thomas Maxfield, by this time an ordained clergyman of Coke's own Church. The result was a new respect for dissenters, a quickened interest in Methodism, an undoubted 'conversion' in the evangelical sense, and the introduction of Methodist practices—hymns, cottage-meetings, extempore prayer, and sermons—into the parish routine and services. It was inevitable that he should be expelled from the parish, and he left it in 1776, to the accompaniment of catcalls, crashing church bells, and physical violence.

He immediately sought out John Wesley, for the second time, and offered himself to the veteran for such service as he could give. Wesley's welcome and charge to his new recruit took the form of a verbal twisting of his own motto, but to Coke it was more than that. The old man's words set him on a course from which, for almost forty years, his life never deviated. 'Go, Brother Coke, and preach the Gospel to all the world', said the old man. Coke never forgot the words. He lived and died in carrying them out.

His rise in Methodism had the brilliance and speed of a meteor, but he maintained his position with the constancy of a fixed star. Wesley appointed him immediately to the London circuit, where he preached to great crowds at the open space now occupied by Tavistock Square, but used him much more as a private secretary and a personal representative than as a circuit minister. Within a year or two he had travelled throughout the country, advising,

preaching, disciplining, according to the old leader's orders. He had hardly achieved his place within the Church when Wesley sent him to Ireland to gather together and preside over the first Irish Conference, and he remained its President until his death in 1814. The place he held in the minds of ordinary people is well illustrated by the story which Wesley records in the *Journal*, without any comment. A woman had written to him to tell him of a strange dream she had had. She dreamed she was in a crowded church, waiting for the service to begin, and, with the prescience of the dreamer, she knew that Wesley would arrive in a few minutes. He did—in his coffin. She saw herself at the old man's funeral. In a moment or two the procession moved up the aisle, led by John Fletcher and Thomas Coke.

It is difficult to exaggerate Coke's importance for Methodism in the second half of the eighteenth century. To find him coupled with John Fletcher of Madeley gives us the clue to his singular eminence. Methodism was no longer a phenomenon; it was a factor to be reckoned with in English life. After forty years of growing separation from the Church of England it had evolved an organization of its own, which was growing more rigid with every year that passed. The authority of Conference over local trustees, and of local trustees over preachers and preaching-houses, were problems which grew ever more acute. Older men, who had shared the beginnings with Wesley, had died or retired. Charles Wesley had already ceased itinerating. While it would be manifestly untrue to say that the early spirit had disappeared, it is at least fair to point out that, as the early Society became an ecclesiastical organization, it hardened in many ways. When Coke joined Wesley the veteran was over seventy and the recruit just under thirty. Wesley himself would find it difficult to welcome the urgent, world-wide schemes of his new helper.

Coke was not a logical, practical thinker like Wesley, nor a writer and theologian like Fletcher, but he brought back to Methodism qualities which Fletcher had given to it in earlier days. He had a verve, an enthusiasm, above all an optimism, which Methodism sadly needed. Its dangerous parochialism was shaken by his world-wide vision, and its practical, sometimes finical measurement of a situation by his cry: 'It shall be done!'

It is not surprising that Coke's ascent into the high places of Methodism should not be everywhere welcomed. Men were suspicious for many reasons. They regarded him as ambitious, and some of his unwise actions in America, such as his signing of the 'loyal address' to General Washington, and his founding with Asbury of Cokesbury College, gave ground for their charge. He was suspected of a desire to succeed Wesley on the leader's death. Again, the fear was substantiated by the haste with which he returned from America when he read of Wesley's death. He even paid three guineas to a fishing smack to take him off the ship near the Cornish coast and land him at Penzance that he might reach London a little sooner. The preachers disliked the Anglican Church, very often with good reason. Coke never forgot he was an ordained clergyman—one of the only three remaining within Methodism after Wesley's death.

Many years went by before Coke was accepted at his true value by Methodism, or at any rate by his colleagues. Two other factors contributed to this—his legal standing and his easy access to the nobility. Yet, through both

of these things, he was able to give significant service to the Methodist people.

We have already said that the position and authority of Conference needed to be defined and protected. Wesley put the matter very much into Coke's hands. In 1783 the Deed of Declaration was drawn up. Coke had worked closely with Counsel and with Wesley's own solicitor, Clulow, in its preparation. It safeguarded the future of Methodism, whatever happened to Wesley, and gave Conference almost authoritarian powers. 'Conference', for the purposes of the Deed, consisted of one hundred nominated preachers and their successors. This left almost the same number outside the 'Legal Hundred'. It was unfortunate that Coke should have the blame for the one part of the Deed which Wesley had kept strictly in his own hands—the selection of the preachers. Those included gave him no thanks, and those overlooked, despite Wesley's assurances that his secretary would not and could not have influenced his choice, took a long time to forgive him.

In a different way, Coke's acquaintance with what Wesley slyly called 'the great' opened him to dislike and served the Church. Whitfield, the potboy, was more at ease with the nobility than Wesley, the Fellow of Lincoln, and Wesley here represented Methodism. More than once, however, Coke's having been at college with Lords Liverpool and Addison stood him in good stead. French prisoners, British service men, West African colonists, and West Indian slaves were all benefited by Coke's personal approach to the Government.

A catalogue, even of interest and achievements, may be boring, but only by recalling rapidly Coke's many interests can his tremendous significance be realized. Those who remember his name at all associate it, rightly, with the missionary work of Methodism. For thirty years he campaigned, preached, travelled, collected, and wrote in the cause of his projected Missions. He visited the West Indies half a dozen times. He was shipwrecked, chased by frigates and privateers, and taken prisoner in the same cause. He gave his whole fortune and that of his first wife to the founding and support of missionary work. It is just that, when Methodism remembers him at all, it should remember him for his unique place in the missionary movement.

How remarkable his missionary work was, however, can only be appreciated when the breadth of other interests is realized.

His father was an apothecary and Thomas inherited Bartholomew Coke's humanitarianism. It was said that no doctor could make a living in Brecon while the apothecary was there and that was so, not only because of the old man's skill, but because of his kindness and sympathy. He loved those whom he served, and healed minds as well as bodies. Thomas Coke, with this background and his volatile, eager, Celtic temperament found his sympathies engaged in innumerable good causes. There was a difference. The son, having passed through the refining fires of an evangelical conversion, knew that men's deepest needs were lodged in the soul. He loved men because he loved God. He saw every enterprise as an opportunity to 'preach the Gospel to all the world'. His one message was Charles Wesley's—'For all, for all, my Saviour died.' Men and children, slave and free, had the right to become sons of God.

In support of these claims let us make a list of his interests during the twenty years after Wesley first sent him to America. It is astonishingly wide. Sunday schools, chaplaincy services, prisoners-of-war, slavery, Bible translations,

continental missions, Church reunion—all claim his attention. Of course his judgement was not always right. Of course he accepted expedient courses. Of course his actions were frequently contradictory. The failures are insignificant compared with what he achieved and helped others to achieve.

There were no Sunday schools in central or west Cornwall until he began one in Liskeard. His example was then taken up all over Cornwall.

Methodist soldiers in Gibraltar, South Africa, and India had no chaplains or ministers of their own convictions until he appointed the first of them—M'Mullen to Gibraltar and McKenny to the Cape.

Thousands of prisoners-of-war were languishing in the Medway, at Devonport, and at Portsmouth as a result of the Napoleonic wars. They had no recreation, no friends, and lived in degradation and filth. Coke appointed William Toaze, of Sevenoaks, to labour in the Medway hulks and other French-speaking preachers went to the other areas.

Wilberforce received the last letter that Wesley wrote—an exhortation to continue until the slaves were free. The next year Coke committed the Conference to the Abolitionist cause. He preached against slavery wherever he went, in England, America, or the West Indies. He was threatened, beaten, flung into swamps and turned from slave-owners' doors in the United States. It is not surprising when one recalls that he could write in his *Journal* that he preached the funeral sermon of a local magnate 'and said not one good thing of him, for he was a great friend of slavery'.

After the French Revolution had broken out he went to France to try and begin a mission in Paris. That he even escaped with his life is surprising for when he came out from the room he had had hired, after his first service, he found a mob outside. The leader was swinging a noose at the end of a rope and they warned him that if he was not gone immediately he would be hanged to the nearest lamp-post.

Notice, now, how these various interests all become linked to the great design. The chaplains he appointed became the spearhead of the Methodist attack—on Roman Catholicism and superstition in Spain and Portugal, and on paganism in South Africa. The prisoners-of-war, returned to France after Waterloo, took Bibles and Testaments with them, and provided ready helpers in some cases for those who later continued the work on the Continent which Coke had tried to start in Paris under the eyes of the Revolutionary goddess of Reason. The cause of the slaves resulted in the first missions to the west coast of Africa, to the colony which Coke aided Wilberforce in establishing for freed slaves from Britain, the West Indies, and the United States.

It must not be thought that Coke could only think of the West Indies or the Continent. He was the pioneer of Home Missions in Great Britain. The turn of the century found Methodism settled down in the routine administration and itineration of established circuits. At the same time, Ireland was largely in the power of ignorant, harsh priests and untouched by the evangelical faith. Wide areas of England—especially in Devon, the Midland counties, East Anglia, and the Fens—had heard no Methodist preaching. Wales was without the Bible in the Welsh tongue. To all these three countries Coke turned his attention. Gideon Ouseley was sent to Ireland, and laboured with such effect that his name is still remembered and honoured there. Missions were begun

in Wales, though they lapsed for a time after Coke's death. Modern Home Missions in England owe their origin and inspiration to the vision of this tremendous evangelist, who persuaded Conference to set apart a group of men to travel round wide country areas in a day when the ordinary circuits could ill spare them.

Coke's significance for America must be assessed by someone more familiar with American history than the present writer. All that need be said here is that he was, under God and by the direction of John Wesley, the instrument of the founding of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which saved the people of the remoter areas from ecclesiastical extravagances and personal despair. With his friend Francis Asbury he must stand high on the roll of honour of Christian heroes in the United States. That he could achieve such a position in the days immediately following the War of Independence proves him to have been a man of indeed remarkable stature.

Consistency was never one of Coke's virtues, and this is nowhere seen more clearly than in his ecclesiastical relationships. Few men of his day did more to drive Methodism into a position where reconciliation with the Church of England was impossible. Yet he loved the Church of England in which he was brought up and, both with it and with another Church, he was a pioneer of Union, or Reunion. He attempted to force the Episcopal Methodists in America into union with the 'historic' episcopal Church. He tried to draw the 'High Church' party in Methodism into union with the Anglican Church in England after Wesley's death, and he even wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury suggesting that a selected group of Methodist preachers be ordained by the Archbishop, with authority to preach and itinerate throughout the country in their normal fashion. This simple-minded attempt to regularize the position for which Bishop Butler censured John Wesley drew a courteous and detailed letter of refusal from the Archbishop!

More interesting, perhaps, in view of the wider union deliberations to which we have come, is the fact that during 1786 Coke, apparently representing Wesley, was in touch with the Moravians. He made to La Trobe 'an unexpected proposition of the union of the Brethren with the Methodists'—an overture which gave the Moravians 'more fear than joy'!

It is impossible to understand Coke's place in the story of Methodism unless one understands something of his relentless optimism and of his untiring energy for any project which had in it the slightest hope of a successful issue. He saw everything in terms of Christ's Kingdom and, without pausing to weigh up possibilities, he flung himself into any course which might advance that Kingdom. He seldom considered whether this scheme was consistent with that, and we have the extraordinary picture of his being involved in schemes utterly contradictory to each other because he believed that each or either might be for the furtherance of the Gospel.

Above all, everything to which he put his hand had in some way to contribute to the overmastering passion of his life—the taking of the Gospel to India and the East. It is in this, the aspect of his life that is best known, that we see the real man. He wanted the world for Christ. Like Wilberforce, he had to fight his critics and his friends almost every inch of the way. Even those who loved him best were unwilling, until the very end, to put his schemes for

the Eastern Mission into reality. When he finally sailed on the last day of 1813, it was not to Ceylon but to his death in the Indian Ocean on 4th May 1814. From the publication of the *Plan for the Establishment of Missions Amongst the Heathen* and the more human and important *Address to the Pious and Benevolent* in 1786 until his death he kept alive the knowledge that Methodism's parish was the world. His *Plan* and *Address* were earlier than Carey's notable *Appeal*. In this, as in all things, he was the pioneer. But it needed almost thirty years of drudgery, sacrifice, and passionate pleading before Methodism suddenly became the first Protestant Church committed to the missionary enterprise as part of its normal life and work.

Perhaps it was all to the good of the work that he was so frustrated. When Methodism began her missionary work the Napoleonic wars were almost over and the ban on missionaries in India had been raised. Within ten years of Coke's death Methodist missionaries were proclaiming the Gospel in India and Africa, in Ceylon and the West Indies, in Australasia and the South Seas. Only history yet unwritten will give us the full measure of the man.

CYRIL J. DAVEY

SHADES OF FEUERBACH

I

CURIOSITY prompted me recently to ask various people who might have been expected to know: 'Have you ever heard of Feuerbach?' The results were diverting. The most frequent answer, given with a look of blank bewilderment, was: 'No! Who was he?' On four occasions only did anyone admit to having heard of the man, and then three barely knew more than his name; only the fourth, a German, knew anything of his significance. Beyond this, two college dons, whose work lay in a field where ignorance would have condemned them, were the only people who showed any competent knowledge of the man or his work.

After this I had better confess that I also was among those to whom Feuerbach was a dimly remembered name, figuring in histories of modern theology and philosophy as a disciple of the great Hegel in the thirties and forties of the nineteenth century. He was in fact one of the outstanding young left-wing Hegelians who broke away from his master's rarefied doctrine of Absolute Spirit as the ground of reality, turned his dialectic against him, and so paved the way for Karl Marx and his materialistic conception of history. Two references in some reading I was doing awakened my curiosity about him and sent me browsing once more in those philosophical histories to re-call what I had once read, and finally to Feuerbach himself. One was a paragraph in J. F. Hecker's *Moscow Dialogues* to which I shall return. The other was the reading of T. G. Masaryk's *Spirit of Russia*. Though that book comes no farther down in time than 1914, there is no better introduction to the understanding of the Russian mind, written as it is with a fellow Slav's

insight and sympathy. By far the larger part of it is taken up with the division caused in Russian life by the attempted westernization of Russia by Peter the Great and the continuation of that policy by the masterful and dominating figure of Catherine the Great. That pursuit brought acute tension both among the Russian nobility and the Russian intelligentsia. On the one hand were the Westernizers, despising Russia for its backwardness, aping the manners, copying the customs, and even speaking the language of the West, especially of France and Germany, becoming sceptical and unbelieving, turning their backs on the old ways and the old faith for Western modernity. On the other hand were the Slavophiles, to whom Russia and all things Russian were still dear, who were not unmindful of Russia's gaunt needs, yet wanted Russia to be Russia and become, what in their hearts they dreamed she might be, Messiah among the nations and saviour of humanity. But deep down in the hearts of both Slavophiles and Westernizers was the shame of the evil that cursed Russia's life, serfdom, coupled with penitence for long denial of the promised deliverance. For Russia has been a land with a nameless wrong and a sense of thwarted justice tugging at the hearts of her people, and to remember that is to go a long way to understand her convulsive history.

This is not a record of Russian serfdom nor the tale of the liberation of the serfs, but an attempt to measure the baneful influence of a wayward thinker. But the history of the one comes into that of the other, and notice must be taken of it. The emancipation of the serfs, dreamed of a hundred years before, but denied again and again, only came with Alexander the Second in 1861—almost a direct consequence of Sevastopol and the Crimean War, as the reform of 1905 was brought about by the reverberations of defeat by Japan. The emancipation even then was only achieved after fierce struggle between the progressives and the moderates, between the opponents and the supporters of the institution. This struggle reflected the tensions of early years which split Russian life in twain in the first half of the nineteenth century. Kropotkin comments mordantly on the evils of serfdom in his *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*. Support of the institution in the name of Orthodoxy brought religion into disrepute. Herzen, one of the Westernizers, termed serfs 'baptized property'. Gogol wrote of *Dead Souls*, and showed with all possible force that Christian slavery was based on the Bible. A Russian translation of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was forbidden by an absolutist censorship lest Russian readers should be struck by the parallel between negro slaves and *muzhyk* serfs.

II

But what has Feuerbach to do with all this? Barely more than a dozen years before 1861 were those millennial years, 1848-9, as they must have seemed to revolutionaries and reformers throughout Europe. Marx and Engels both testify to this. Years of Chartists in Britain, the Paris Revolution, the Polish Insurrection, the Roman Republic, and the Frankfurt Parliament! Such signs of the dawn of a new day could not fail to be observed in Russia by those, at least, whose gaze was turned westward. One medium for the communication of ideas was contemporary German philosophy. So comes Masaryk's significant note:

From 1848 onward, German philosophy was continually at work through the writings of Hegel and Feuerbach, and through those of the anti-reactionary materialists, Vogl, Buchner, and Moleschatt. During those years Schopenhauer had great influence in Russia.

It was thus that the name of Feuerbach arrested my attention. Over and over again, in the sketches Masaryk gives of the leaders of Russian thought at that time, the name of Feuerbach appears. What did that purport?

But here another trail of inquiry opens up. The clue is supplied by the title of a tiny monograph by Frederick Engels: *Feuerbach, the Roots of the Socialist Philosophy*. The author's preface is dated: London, 21st February 1888, five years after Marx's death. The little volume sets out to give an account of the rise of the Marxian Movement. Engels goes back perforce to the period of the preparation of Germany for the revolution of 1848. All that has happened since, he says, is only a continuation of 1848, only a carrying-out of the last will and testament. In Germany, then, as in the eighteenth-century France, revolutionary philosophic conceptions introduced a breaking-up of existing political conditions. In a curious way, these revolutionary conceptions were reached by turning the great Hegel against himself. The Hegelian conception of the State had been raised to the rank of a royal Prussian philosophy of government. Hegelian notions served as a philosophical benediction of despotism, police government, star-chamber justice, and the censorship. This was how Frederick William the Third and his subjects understood it. Hegelianism, on its conservative side, had become the bulwark of reaction. It was this which turned some of Hegel's younger left-wing pupils to revolt. When in 1840 orthodox pietism and absolutionist feudal reaction ascended the throne with Frederick the Fourth, the revolt became open and unavowed. To deny the dominant religion and the existing state became the first objective of the rebels. This was the antithesis to Hegel's thesis.

But politics, says Engels naively, were at that time a very thorny field, and so the main fight was directed against religion, even though this was also indirectly, particularly after 1840, a political fight. Strauss's *Leben Jesu* marks one moment in the struggle, Bruno Bauer's *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte* another, in the sceptical attack on the Gospel history. Supernatural religion was repudiated at the same time that Hegel's philosophical groundwork for it was being overturned. But if the Absolute Spirit was no longer the basis of reality, what was? Refuge could only be found in a materialistic conception of Nature. The young Hegelians were driven back upon English-French materialism through the necessities of their fight against positive religion. But Hegelianism derived the materialism of Nature from the Absolute Spirit, of which it was an alienation. How could the contradiction be resolved?

Feuerbach supplied the answer. Engels's crucial paragraph must be quoted:

Then came Feuerbach's *Das Wesen des Christentums*. With one blow it cut the contradiction, in that it placed materialism on the throne again without any circumvention. Nature exists independently of all philosophies. It is the foundation upon which we, ourselves products of nature, are built. Outside man and nature nothing exists, and the higher beings which our religious phantasies have created are only the fantastic reflections of our individuality. The cord was broken, the system was scattered and

destroyed, the contradiction, since it only existed in the imagination, was solved. One must himself have experienced the delivering power of this book to get a clear idea of it. The enthusiasm was universal, we were all for the moment followers of Feuerbach. How enthusiastically Marx greeted the new idea and how much he was influenced by it, in spite of all his critical reservations, one may read in the *Holy Family*.

Here then, we arrive at the significance of Feuerbach. He is a mainspring of the Marxian repudiation of supernatural religion and recourse to atheism and the philosophy of materialism, and anyone who would understand the meaning of that repudiation in Germany, in Russia, or elsewhere, must reckon with Feuerbach.

III

It is time to turn to the man himself. Ludwig Andreas Feuerbach (the name means Fire-brook) was fourth of five sons of a celebrated German criminologist, Paul Johann Anselm von Feuerbach, and was born 28th July 1804, at Landshut, in Bavaria. In his youth, as a pupil of the Gymnasium at Anspach, he was a pious Christian—pious with all the energy of his character. There was also a Christian background to the lives of Marx and Engels. In his fervent piety, Feuerbach devoted himself to theology at Heidelberg, but found it unsatisfying, and went to Berlin. A letter to his father at the time is very revealing:

I have abandoned theology, not, however, wantonly or recklessly or from dislike, but because it does not satisfy me, because it does not give me what I indispensably need. I want to press Nature to my heart, from whose depth the cowardly theologian shrinks back; I want to embrace man, but man in his entirety.

The meaning of this last cryptic utterance will become clearer later. At Berlin Feuerbach came under Hegel's spell for a while, but broke at length with the master and determined to throw off speculative philosophy altogether and devote himself to the only true science, that of Nature. The rest of Feuerbach's life was simple and uneventful. After a short period as private tutor at Erlangen, where he found that the scholasticism of a royal university was not to his mind, he retired to Bruckberg, a small village near Anspach, his birthplace in Bavaria. There Nature and Science absorbed his attention for twenty-five years, broken only by the publication of his books and a visit to Heidelberg in 1848 to lecture on 'The Essence of Religion'. In 1866, he removed to Rechenberg, near Nuremberg, living in retirement with his family and a small circle of friends. These last years were clouded by poverty. His death occurred in 1872.

Two works of Feuerbach only need detain us here. Of these the first and larger, to which Engels makes such significant reference, *Das Wesen des Christentums* or *The Essence of Christianity*, was published in 1841. The book-plate of the copy I have used bears the name George Henry Lewes, interesting since it was George Eliot (Marian Evans) who translated the work, as she did Strauss's *Leben Jesu*. A few scattered pencil notes may be those of Lewes. The German edition I have consulted is that of the complete edition of ten volumes of all his works published in Stuttgart in 1903.

In the preface to the second German edition, which appears in George Eliot's translation, Feuerbach reaffirms his position in view of the clamour excited by the first edition of his book, setting it forth as 'a faithful correct translation of the Christian Religion out of the oriental language of imagery into plain speech'. His standpoint in opposition to his master, Hegel, is that thought is generated from its opposite, from matter, from existence, from the senses.

I unconditionally repudiate absolute, immaterial, self-sufficing speculation—that speculation which draws its material from within. For *my* thought I require the senses, especially sight; I found my ideas on materials which can be appropriated only through the activity of the senses.

His philosophy therefore will start with no abstract being, like the Hegelian Absolute, but with a *real* being—man, set in the material universe. The consequence of this for theology is that it is not concerned with the nature of God, but with the nature of man.

I show (in the first part of my book) that the true sense of Theology is Anthropology, that there is a distinction between the predicates of the divine and human nature, and, consequently, no distinction between the divine and human *subject*.

This means, outside man there is no God. As we shall see, in Feuerbach's sense, it is not God who creates man, but man who creates God out of the dreams of his unsatisfied nature. What is more, Feuerbach claims that in so doing, he is letting religion speak for itself.

It is not I, but religion that worships man, although religion, or rather theology, denies this; it is not I, an insignificant individual, but religion itself that says: 'God is man, man is God'; it is not I, but religion that denies that God is *not* man, but only *ens rationis*—since it makes God become man, and then constitutes this God, not distinguished from man, having a human form, human feelings, and human thoughts, the object of its worship and veneration.

In this very perverse inference from the doctrine of the Incarnation, Feuerbach claims only to have found 'the key to the cipher of the Christian religion, only extricated its true meaning from the web of contradictions and delusions called theology'. He admits the sacrilege, but

if my work is negative, irreligious, atheistic, let it be remembered that atheism—at least in the sense of this work—is the secret of religion itself; that religion itself, not indeed on the surface, but fundamentally, not in intention or according to its own supposition, but in its heart, in its essence, believes in nothing else than the worth and divinity of human nature.

This is what he means by reducing theology to anthropology, and at the same time exalting anthropology, very much, he says, as Christianity, while lowering God into man, at the same time made man into God, though by a further process this human God was made a transcendental, imaginary God, remote from man. So

religion is the dream of the human mind. Hence I do nothing more to religion—and to speculative philosophy and theology also—than to open its eyes, or rather to

turn its gaze from the internal, toward the external, i.e. I change the object as it is in the imagination into the object as it is in reality.

Here, then, is the core of the matter according to Feuerbach. Man creates God out of the imagination of his own heart, but there is no reality outside of him corresponding to his imagination within.

Man—this is the mystery of religion—projects his being into objectivity, and then again makes himself an object to this projected image of himself thus converted into a subject, he thinks of himself, is an object to himself, but as the object of an object, of another being than himself.

Thus, in and through God, man has in view himself alone.

Here, indeed, is a Copernican revolution in theology. Man creates God, not God man. The consequences for the doctrine of the Incarnation we have already seen. Man makes himself divine. So with the others which he treats one by one. H. R. Mackintosh recalls Barth's telling summary of the results of this special illusionistic treatment.

Thus God is the self-feeling of man freed from all the limitations of reality. In the personality of God man celebrates the supernatural and immortal character of his own personal nature. The absoluteness of God represents the effort of our mind to reach by abstraction an absolute datum for reflective thought. We call God 'love' because we wish for, and have formed a picture of, a Being that will satisfy all our desires and dreams. God is the sign of the human soul personified. Faith in Providence is a conviction of our own worth as immeasurably superior to that of the world. Miracle is the magic power of fancy to mitigate the cruel predicaments of life. The Holy Spirit is the soul of man in its urgent or enthusiastic character, objectified by itself. The Trinity is an hypostatized form of the social impulse.

Feuerbach thus stands ready, according to Barth, with an idealistic apparatus into which any given doctrine may be inserted, and which may be trusted to stamp upon all the same mark of ultimate futility. Revelation is no more than a man's speaking to his own heart. The devout mind starts from itself, makes a detour by an imaginary object it calls God, and returns to itself again. 'Man is the beginning, the centre, and the end of religion.'

The second and shorter work, *Das Wesen der Religion*, or *The Essence of Religion*, which we notice here, is in some ways even more distinctive of the position Feuerbach ultimately reached. It is dated 1845, and forms the principal basis for the thirty lectures he gave at Heidelberg in the winter of 1848-9 to a promiscuous audience which he had been invited to address by a student body in the university. In this work he set out to fill a gap left in his *Essence of Christianity* and to carry farther the argument that 'theology is anthropology' by adding the words 'and physiology'. Now his conception of religion is embraced in the two words 'Nature and Man'. Here the increasing naturalism of Feuerbach asserts itself. Man's dependence on Nature is the last and the only source of religion. Supernaturalism is thus excluded, and Theism, or belief in God over and above and apart from Nature, declared to be false. Man, indeed, is but a child of Nature, though it must be confessed a child with some extraordinary qualities.

His feeling of dependence is the source of religion, but the object of this dependence is originally nothing but Nature. This is manifest because we cannot exist without light, without air, without water, without food. This dependence in the animal is unconscious and unreflected; in man, being elevated in consciousness and imagination, it becomes religion. Thus all life depends on the change of the seasons; but man alone celebrates the change by dramatic representations and festival acts. But such festivals, which imply and represent nothing but the change of the seasons, or of the phases of the moon, are the oldest, the first, and the real confessions of human religion.

This, in effect, makes the essence of religion nothing but nature-worship.

Nature is not only the first and original object, but also *the lasting source, the continuous, although hidden background of religion*. The belief that God, even when He is imagined as a supernatural being, different from Nature, is an object existing out of man, an objective being, as the philosophers call it, this belief has its only source in the fact, that the objective being, which really exists outside of man, viz. the world or Nature, is originally God. The existence of Nature is not, as Theism imagines, based upon the existence of God, but vice versa: the existence of God, or rather the belief in His existence, is based upon the existence of Nature. You are obliged to imagine God as an existing being, only because you are by Nature herself to pre-suppose the existence of Nature as the cause and condition of your existence and consciousness, and the very first idea connected with the thought of God is nothing but the very idea that He is the existence preceding your own and pre-supposed to it.

Theistic belief, according to Feuerbach, affirms an independent existence of God. A similar independent existence must then on that hypothesis be granted to stars, stones, and animals, the Gods of blinded heathenism, and the existence of the God of Theism does not differ from the existence of the Egyptian Apis.

Even those qualities in which the Divine Being is supposed to differ from human beings are originally and implicitly only qualities of Nature. Thus we speak of the power and eternity of God, celebrate Him as all-kind, all-embracing, universal and unchangeable, illimitable, supreme, mysterious and inconceivable, a being independent of the human will, unmoved by human wants and passions, always equal to Himself, ruling according to unchangeable laws, establishing His institutions, unchangeable for all time.

But this being again is nothing but Nature, which remains the same in all changes, never exhibiting the vacillations of an arbitrary, wilful ruler, but subject in all her manifestations to unalterable laws; inexorable, regardless Nature.

Here then is a downright and forthright repudiation of Theistic belief, and of the existence of any being other than Nature who can be called God. What can this be but Atheism? Yet Feuerbach is reported to have been indignant when his view of religion was so described. His own words rise up in evidence against him. The sentence from *Das Wesen des Christentums* already quoted: 'Atheism is the secret of religion itself', is part of that evidence. Another, right at the end of the introductory chapter of the same book, confirms it: 'What yesterday was still religion, is no longer such today; and what today is atheism, tomorrow will be religion.' Theism, that is, according to Feuerbach, is passing into atheism, just as he believes Christian faith is becoming superstition. A sentence from *The Essence of Religion* is even more boldly prophetic:

The time will come when the prophecy of Lichtenberg will be fulfilled, and the belief in God in general, consequently also the belief in a rational God, will be considered as superstition just as well as already the belief in the miraculous Christian God in flesh is considered as superstition, and when, therefore, instead of the Church light of simple belief, and instead of the twilight of rationalistic belief, the pure light of Nature and reason will enlighten and warm mankind.

IV

The significance of Feuerbach, however, is that he reveals the seed-plot in which Atheistic Marxianism came to birth. One of the standing riddles of the Marxian philosophy is why a system of thought which was concerned with justice for the landless and propertyless masses should have so roundly repudiated supernatural religion. The spread of Marxianism through Europe, which is so remarkable a feature of our time, has been associated with, and has been a contributory factor of, that 'decay of any belief in supernaturalism over a large part of Europe and America' of which the Webbs speak in their two ponderous volumes on Soviet Communism. Feuerbach, Marx, and Engels all had some Christian background. Feuerbach was deeply religious in his youth. Engels came of a pious family, Marx of a Jewish family which had become at least conventionally Christian. Why did all three repudiate the faith of their upbringing, cast off belief in a spiritual basis to reality and come to hold so tenaciously to a philosophy of materialism which made man simply a creature of Nature and a being of time? The question is important, because the same conception of human life is now widely spread through the modern world and must be reckoned with by all who retain any faith in supernatural religion. An outstanding characteristic of modern man is that he spurns 'other-worldliness' and concentrates all his effort on 'this-world' in the conviction that, forgetting the one, he can make of the other what he will.

This is essentially the attitude of the Marxian Communists, and the roots of it in them lie back in Feuerbach, Marx, and Engels. One ground of their repudiation of Christianity was in their opposition to the conservative Prussian State with which the Prussian Church was identified, as later Lenin and the Bolsheviks in Russia repudiated the Orthodox Church as an instrument of Tsarist reaction. That line of reflection we cannot pursue farther here. The other ground for their revolt from supernatural religion was the deepened feeling for Nature as the ground of human life, which science was evoking. We have seen how Feuerbach turned from theology and the Hegelian speculation about the Absolute to the study of natural science. This feeling for Nature and man as a part of Nature runs through all his thinking. In J. F. Hecker's *Moscow Dialogues*, the Soviet apologist speaks thus of Feuerbach's *Das Wesen des Christentums*:

In this brilliant treatise, born of deep religious emotion, Christianity was brought to earth, and a frank religious humanism and materialism was advocated. Its central theme was that all religious values, including God, are human values, to which a supernatural sanction has been attached by human imagination. Man is not the image of God, God is the image of man. Thus there is nothing outside of Nature and man. . . . Nature is the basis of spirit and therefore should also be the basis of philosophy.

So now Feuerbach becomes significant in another way as one who contributed to the displacement of theology by science as the guide of life which again is so distinctive of the modern man. The myth of science as the agent of human regeneration is widely dispersed. Science is the instrument by which the Marxian hopes to transform the world. It is the basis of that religion without God which Julian Huxley offers us, and the ground of that conviction with which Joseph Needham assures us that history is on the side of the Communist world-revolution.

How are we to meet the challenge of naturalistic materialism and the this-worldly creed to which it leads? Feuerbach is dead some three generations ago but it is still worth while to wrestle with the answer that ought to have been given to him. H. R. Mackintosh, indeed, quotes approvingly the dictum of a continental theologian as recently as 1912, that none of the greater theologians of the nineteenth century stood up to Feuerbach or gave a serious refutation of his argument. Yet an answer surely is possible. Granted, for instance, that man is nought but a child of Nature, he is a rather remarkable child. The very opening words of *Das Wesen des Christentums* acknowledge that: 'Man is religious—the brutes have no religion.' Who is this creature man whose dreams of what he would desire to be constitute religion, and what is that Nature which in him evokes these dreams? If the dreams are merely subjective, and no outward reality corresponds thereto, by what right does he conclude that his senses which nature excites give evidence of reality outside him? Feuerbach should have been consistent. He cannot have it both ways. We cannot be deceived in our deepest thoughts, yet in touch with reality only in our bodily sensations. If we are deceived in the one case, why not also in the other? Thinking in that way, we might easily end, not in reality, but in illusion.

Moreover the argument that religion is merely a particular case of wishful thinking, a dream to which nothing corresponds outside ourselves, conceals a fallacy. Of course, as H. R. Mackintosh says, if a man likes to think in this way and believe that nothing exists outside his sensations or imaginings, it is hard to prove him wrong. No logic will overthrow solipsism, the belief there is no reality beyond myself. But every normal man thinks that his sensations and perceptions are sensations and perceptions of a real world and that his deepest convictions are shaped by the very nature of things. It is true things do not exist because we desire them, but we should not infer from that that because we desire them they do not exist. This is the concealed fallacy in Feuerbach's view. God, he says, is only a projected desire, and therefore does not exist outside ourselves. This is erroneous thinking. The very fact that Nature and experience unite to evoke the desire and the need of God in us is some ground for believing that in an intelligible world Someone exists who meets the desire and satisfies the need. To guard ourselves against mere wishful thinking is wise, to distrust our heart's deepest affirmations is foolish.

Then again the view that we are merely creatures of Nature, bound in 'this-world', children of time and not heirs of eternity, as all materialist philosophy avows, makes human life meaningless. The end of all our striving is the grave; materialism has no answer to the ultimate questions of the 'why and wherefore' of human existence. No Atheistic Communist that I have who

ever heard of will ever adequately face that issue. He simply buries his head in the sand, and says the question of an after-life does not interest him. For, to confine human life within the bounds of space and time is to denude it of the very quality which makes it supremely human, viz.: its insatiable urge to burst its bonds. Eternity is in our hearts. The thirst for life is such that if the grave were all, our human existence would be a mockery. A merely materialistic philosophy demeans human life. H. B. Alexander in his *Short History of Philosophy* recalls that Feuerbach's first work was an anonymous pamphlet, *Thoughts on Death and Immortality*, directed against belief in a personal existence after death. But, gradually, goes on Alexander, as Feuerbach departed from Hegelianism and repudiated Theism, he became more and more crassly materialistic, culminating in a coarse pun (which I have not been able to verify): '*Man ist was er isst*' ('Man is what he eats').

On the other hand, the 'other-worldly' aspect of Christian faith should not betray us into denial of the reality of 'this-world'. While Atheistic Marxianism denies one half of the antithesis, this-worldly, other-worldly, Christianity holds them both together. We are children of time, but also heirs of eternity. We are creatures of Nature, but also born to be sons of God. So a robust Christian faith accepts this world as the creation of God, and makes it serve as material for the achievement of the spirit. Few things are more outstanding in the Gospel narrative than Christ's lordship over nature, conquering disease and death. Long before Marx coined the phrase, Christ not only accepted the world, but mastered and transformed it. A merely other-worldly faith is a distortion of true Christianity. At that point the Christian can come alongside the Marxian with a robust and healthy realism. He will reverence Nature as the creation of God more deeply than Feuerbach who denied that God had anything to do with it, and rejoice in the triumphs of Science and use them for human good more intensely than the most ardent Communist.

Again it can be affirmed against Feuerbach that his naturalism has made him deficient in moral penetration. This is not to say he is entirely without moral insight. He is not, and indeed Engels found fault with him because he introduced the necessity of 'love' in something like the Christian sense into his conception of human relations. Engels's ruthless view of historical materialism only issued in inexorable social justice, and Feuerbach was of rather finer moral mould. Nevertheless his moral insight is a trifle superficial. You can read whole chapters of *The Essence of Christianity* and find little discernment that man's moral need is what most drives him to God, and little awareness of the deep distortion that sin has caused in the life of man. There is one short chapter: 'God as a Moral Being, or Law', but it is very superficial. In *The Essence of Religion* I was unable to find even the word 'sin'. It is what we should expect. With the elimination of God as a real ground of human existence, and the reduction of human life to naturalism, moral distinctions become blurred. They do in Atheistic Communism. To quote the Webbs again, 'the bottom has dropped out' of the code of behaviour which the Churches had formulated; but it is not clear what new basis of morality natural man will find.

Finally, Feuerbach's view as it appears in these two works reveals a deficient sense of the significance of history. In this, of course, he differs from Marx, who emphasized historic materialism. Feuerbach's naturalism made it easy

for him to think of man alongside the brute creation as just another natural species. He reveals little sense of the shame and splendour of history as the story of man's struggles, failures, and achievements. So no living sense of the Person of Christ floods his pages. Marx, on the other hand, was consumed with the poignancy of the historical struggle, even though he concentrated undue interest on economic injustice and the class struggle. But even his sense of the significance of the historical struggle pales beside the Christian view in Old Testament and New, which sees human history as the battle-ground of right and wrong, and the majestic sweep of the righteousness of God to victory, culminating in that one life beneath the Syrian skies in whom God and man most surely meet.

E. C. URWIN

THEOLOGY: THE MODERN PROTESTANT APPROACH

I SOMETIMES think that if we could scrap theology we might get down to some real Christianity.' This statement, once made to the writer by a ministerial friend, represents what is still in some quarters a popular view. 'It is the Gospel, not theology, we want' is still heard in some circles, interpreted to mean that it is the emotional content of Christianity that is all-important and not the intellectual. This emphasis was perhaps justifiable at its inception when it arose as a reaction against a theology that had become static, cold, and remote from life. But that day is long past and in the interval the pendulum has swung far, so much so, that large sections of the Church have come near to losing the Gospel because of their neglect of theology. 'Protestantism came to be reduced almost to having no beliefs at all, no foundation in the eternal Gospel, to a kind of "anythingarianism"; and the Church to be little more than a social club.'¹ The slogan current amongst New Testament scholars two or three generations ago is well known: 'Back to Christ and away from St. Paul. Paul was thought to be theological and bothersome; with the Figure of Jesus all was simple and clear. One of the most striking facts about present-day New Testament scholarship is the severe judgement it has passed on this tendency and the manner in which it has shown the baselessness of the assumption that the Gospels are non-theological.

The truth of course is that the moment we begin to reflect upon the Gospel at that moment theology is born; theology means the Church reflecting on the Gospel. Such reflection is an essential and abiding part of the Church's task, not simply in order to satisfy the natural quest of the human mind which seeks a rationale for the faith it accepts, not merely to attempt an answer to the great questions which have exercised the human mind in all ages, but because the Gospel by its very nature makes such theological reflection and inquiry a necessary undertaking if it is to be rightly proclaimed to the world. All the great systems of theology have arisen as the Church has striven to

¹ W. Robinson, *A Companion to the Communion Service*, p. 7.

confess its faith. All true theology is *confessional* theology; it is the Church endeavouring to set forth the content of the Gospel it has received. Brunner has spoken of theology in these terms: 'Theology is an intellectual elaboration of the knowledge of God and His Word which is inherent in the simple faith of the Christian mother, but on the basis of the whole of the Scriptures and the thinking of the Church.'² This statement presents theology in a triple aspect.

(1) *First, it emphasizes that theology is always secondary to the Gospel.* There is first the Gospel of God's mighty acts and then the Church's reflection on their meaning and significance. First the Christian story which arouses the response and faith of the mother and then the drawing out of what is inherent in that story and response. The Gospel exists not for the sake of theology but theology for the sake of the Gospel. Theology is always the handmaid and servant of the Word. 'Theology is *ministerium verbi divini*—service of the Word of God.'³ It is tied to the Word; it possesses no independent existence. Though a human task it is never just the result of man's quest or speculation as is the case with philosophy. It has its origin and its end in God's self-revelation.

(2) *Again theology is essentially Biblical.* It is on the basis of the Scriptures that the Church strives to elaborate the great moments of the Faith. In the Scriptures we are in the presence of the witnesses, the men who heard, who saw with their eyes, whose hands handled that which was from the beginning concerning the Word of life.⁴ All the theological thinking of the Church begins at the point of their testimony.⁵ It is based on that testimony and is judged by it. This is what the Church means when it confesses that the Scriptures are its final Rule of Faith. And it is for this reason that the task of Biblical exegesis holds such a significant place in all theological study.

(3) *Thirdly, theology is closely related to the past thinking of the Church.* The attitude of the Churches which stand in the Reformed Tradition should be clearly understood on this point. The Reformed Churches have always made it clear that no past thinking of the Church is on a level with Holy Scripture or can form part of the Rule of Faith. No tradition of the Church and no system of theology is binding in the sense that the prophetic-apostolic word of Scripture is binding. But this does not mean, as many in modern theological history have interpreted it to mean, that the Church can ignore the centuries and treat as of no account the past theological work of the Church. We cannot, even in the interests of what may be regarded as a more primitive and purer theology, transplant ourselves to the position of the first-century Christians and act and speak as if the historic theological decisions of the Church had never happened and its great Confessions never come to birth. We have to realize that these past decisions and Confessions embody the insights of the Church as it strove to proclaim the content of the Gospel, and though not possessing a final authority, do possess a real secondary authority.⁶ The Church of today cannot profitably begin the study of theology until it has listened to the theological affirmations made by the Church of yesterday and

² *Religion in Life* (Spring Number 1939), p. 178.

³ H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 272.

⁴ 1 John 1¹, 2.

⁵ The many attempts on the part of the Liberal school to get behind the New Testament writers to the so-called 'historical Jesus' may be said to have failed.

⁶ See K. Barth, *Credo*, pp. 179-82.

has become aware of their import and significance. The light-hearted dismissal of all systems of theology prior to the late nineteenth century on the part of some of the Liberals was no proof of their theological understanding.

We come now to a consideration of the function of theology. Students of the Biblical text are familiar with the canon of criticism that where a choice of readings exists the harder reading is to be preferred, the assumption being that when a scribe copying out a manuscript was confronted by a passage hard to understand he was always tempted to simplify it and substitute an easier reading. In a deeper sense this has been the temptation of the Church all through its history, the temptation to modify the Gospel, soften its austerity, rationalize its paradox and adapt it to the contemporary outlook. It is precisely here that theology is presented with one of its great tasks. This task is to measure the proclamation, the thought, the apologetic of the Church over against the revelation made in Jesus Christ. The Church's task is not only to preach but to examine repeatedly its preaching, to ensure that it approximates to the depth and fullness of the Gospel. That is why it is so lamentable to hear a minister of the Church confess that he has little interest in or gift for the study of systematic theology. Every minister should in some measure be a theologian and should have his mind carefully attuned to the theological thought of the Church. Only in that way can he preserve his preaching from the subjectivity, the sentimentality, and the shallowness which threaten it. In this way he shares in the task of the Church as a whole which is to strive against the heretical tendencies which constantly threaten its life. Many of the Church's great theologies have been born in this struggle. Theology has achieved its greatness as it has striven to hold the Church to the full implications of its belief. A modern instance of this fact is the struggle carried on by the German Confessional Church against 'German' Christianity. The famous declaration of the Barmen Synod will rank as a landmark in that struggle.

But theology performs a task which is not only directed toward the Church; it is also directed to those who are outside the Church. In other words theology seeks to do the work of evangelism. We do well to emphasize that the Gospel must be told primarily as a story and not set forth as an intellectual thesis, and that the response demanded by the Gospel is a response of the total being and not just that of the intellect. But we must in no way minimize the importance of the intellect in the apprehension of the Gospel and must realize the importance of the intellectual approach particularly in dealing with educated minds. Theology may render a great service in winning such minds to the allegiance of Christ. The history of the Church affords many examples of this. Who can estimate, for example, the effect on the mind of Europe of such a book as Pascal's *Pensees*, or, still more powerful and far-reaching, the writings of Augustine? Or, to take a modern example, Kierkegaard, who though not a theologian in the technical sense has exercised and continues to exercise a profound influence on the thought of Europe and America? Or Unamuno in his great book *The Tragic Sense of Life*? This aspect of the work to be done by theology needs special emphasis today. Most of the problems raised by modern Europe demand a theological answer. The popular view of theology as an academic study confined to the lecture-room and the scholar is no right

reading of the Church's theological responsibility. The Church must relate its theology to the historic moment though it is never governed by the historic moment. It must make its proclamation at the heart of the existing situation. Daniel Jenkins, writing on 'The Function of a Protestant Faculty of Theology in a University', says:

The desire for an atmosphere of contemplative calm as a suitable setting for the pursuit of theology is romantic, however valuable occasional intervals for contemplative calm may be. Contemplative calm is not the atmosphere of the world or of the Church. The theological faculty, if it is to proclaim properly, must be right down in the midst of the university, the storm-centre of its life, not dreaming of things afar off.⁷

Substitute for the university the contemporary world and this forms a precise statement of the Church's theological task.

Another part of theology's task is the nourishing of the religious life. The belief that the study of theology is a dry and profitless study so far as the growth of the soul is concerned is still widely accepted. Such an attitude is part of the general shallowness of our age which prefers sensation to thought. It has also been helped by the tendency hitherto in the English-speaking world to keep at a safe distance from ideas and concentrate on 'getting things done'. But all high theology can be compared to great poetry; it is an attempt to set forth in words things that often transcend our thought. Theology is concerned with the mystery of God's person and His mighty acts, just as the poet is concerned with his ecstatic vision. There is a closer link that we often realize between the great hymns and liturgies of the Church and the great theologies of the Church; and just as the one may inspire our faith and feed our devotion so may the other. Much of the feeble, humanistic, so-called practical religious life of today would be revolutionized by the earnest pursuit of theology. We should find ourselves among the great spaces of God's truth, with a new dimension of depth in our religious thought and outlook.

With this discussion of the general nature and function of theology in mind we are now in a position to examine some of the chief developments in Protestant theology today and to refer to some of its outstanding features. Most Christians are aware of the profound changes that have taken place in the theological thinking of the Church during the last twenty-five years. We have become conscious of a new accent and a new emphasis in theological speech. This new development has by no means been confined to the Churches of the Reformation; it has made itself felt throughout world Christianity. The revival of what may be called the Scholastic Life and World View within the Roman Catholic Church is a fact of great significance.⁸ Possibly the greatest living interpreter of the thought of Aquinas is Jacques Maritain, whose writings have had such an outstanding influence not only in France but throughout the English-speaking world. Also of very great significance is the work of Fr. M. J. Congar in the oecumenical field,⁹ the liturgical movement in German Roman

⁷ See *The Presbyterian*, February 1945.

⁸ See Samuel G. Craig, *The Revival of Theology in the Roman Catholic Church*, a Paper published by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

⁹ See his *Disunited Christians—Principles of a Catholic Oecumenism*.

Catholicism,¹⁰ and the signs of a new willingness on the part of many Christians in obedience to Rome to enter into conversation with members of the non-Roman Churches. So far as the Reformed Churches are concerned Dr. Otto Piper declares that the modern theological movement has had its fountain-head in the Churches of Germany and Switzerland and in the thinking of the Russian émigrés of the Greek Orthodox Church, Berdyaev, Boulgakov, and others.¹¹ There have been many secondary centres, as witness the striking theological work carried on in the Scandinavian countries, Holland, France, Great Britain, and America.¹² This modern movement has revealed itself in three main directions.

(1) *First there has come about a new sense of the all-importance of Revelation.* If one were asked to name the one theme that has held central place in all Protestant religious thinking since 1918 this would be the reply. Into all the speech and thought of the Church has crept the significant phrase, The Word of God. Karl Barth was the first to present Europe with this dynamic challenge and whatever division of opinion there may be about Barthianism his was the hand, to use a phrase of Karl Heim, that swung the tiller of theology hard in a new direction. Over against conservative orthodoxy on the one hand, which identified God's revelation with the actual letter of Scripture and made it static, and against religious humanism on the other which had forgotten the need for revelation and was fascinated by such ideas as man's quest for God, man's religious consciousness, the psychology of religion, came this new perception of the Word of God as the dynamic action of God in human history, condemning both the legalism of the orthodox and the man-centred emphasis of the Liberals. We were delivered from the welter of subjectivity in which we had so long groped and made aware of the givenness and objectivity of the Christian faith. We realized that on the one hand Revelation was not a code, nor was it on the other simply the climax of man's search for God. We realized that Revelation was God in His Holy action and that such action was prior to and independent of all our thoughts about Him. This conception of the all-importance and priority of the fact of Revelation is at the heart of all vital Protestant religious thinking today.

(2) *A second important development in modern Protestant theology has been a new insight into the teaching of the Reformers.* This development has perhaps not been so notable in the Churches of the English-speaking world as in the Churches of the Continent of Europe, where it has had a marked influence on theology. It has of course many links with the new understanding of Revelation we have already discussed, but though a parallel, is also a separate movement. In the case of Martin Luther, for example, Dr. Piper suggests that the new understanding of the Reformer has been due to two factors: (a) a new method of historical interpretation and (b) the discovery of new and important documents which throw fresh light on Luther's religious development.¹³ The emphasis of

¹⁰ See A. G. Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*.

¹¹ See Dr. Piper's *Current Trends in Continental Theology*, Paper published by Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

¹² W. M. Horton's *Contemporary English Theology* and *Contemporary Continental Theology* provide a good survey of the modern theological field. Much important theological work has been done, however, since these books appeared. A Paper published privately in Ceylon, *Theological Concerns of Our Day*, by Daniel T. Niles, helps to fill the gap.

¹³ See his *Recent Developments in German Protestantism*, to which I am much indebted in this section.

the German philosopher Dilthey on 'interpretation from within' has had a marked effect on the exegetical approach to the Bible and to Church history. We must know not only what the writers of the Bible said; we must know it within the context of the world in which they lived and spoke. We must know what their message meant for themselves, what were the realities toward which they pointed. In other words, Biblical scholarship has discovered, as we shall see later, that the content of the Bible must be interpreted theologically. A similar 'interpretation from within' is necessary in the case of the past thinkers of the Church, such as the Reformers. We must know what their thought meant for themselves and be willing to interpret it in the light of their total theological conception rather than in the light of our own presuppositions. It is at this point that the modern interpretation of Reformation thought has begun and with such fruitful results.

The discovery of Luther's *Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans*, delivered in 1515-16, is of great importance. Dr. Piper declares that these lectures reveal better than any later document the main forces of the religious life of Luther and that they set forth his ideas in a positive manner before the stage of controversy and polemic had started. Paradoxically enough, Dr. Piper's argument points in the direction of Luther being much more a man of the Middle Ages and much more rooted in the Catholic tradition than we have been inclined to think. I quote this striking passage:

Though Luther started a new period in the history of the European spirit, he never made a break with the past period. His lectures on Romans of 1515-16 prove that he understood his own discovery as a correction of medieval Catholicism. . . . He never thought that his principle 'Salvation by faith alone through God's mercy in Christ' was in itself a sufficient basis of religious life, as Protestantism in later times increasingly believed. . . . For Luther this principle presupposed the existence of the One Holy Catholic Church with all its organization and its history.

Dr. Piper goes on to point out that though Luther was opposed to many of the principles and practices of the Church of his day 'he still recognized the everlasting value of her institutions and her doctrine'. The modern study of Luther has begun from this point and has evolved a much fuller picture of the man and his teaching. Former research was inclined to label everything in his teaching that was not in direct relation to the central doctrine of justification by faith as 'residues of his Catholic period'.

In the study of Calvin, too, modern scholarship has gone a long way to show, in the words of Dr. J. S. Whale, that 'Calvin's massive theological and ecclesiological system is not a clean breach with historic Christendom, but a structure resting on Holy Scripture and ancient ecclesiastical usage'.¹⁴ The researches of the Scottish scholar, W. D. Maxwell, have shown how much Calvin endeavoured to relate reformed worship to the Catholic tradition.¹⁵ One example was his desire that each Sunday morning service should be a eucharistic service and that at a time when the medieval custom was lay communion only once or twice a year, which Calvin described as a 'diabolic invention'. To quote Dr. Whale once more: 'In this reform, as in much else, he, Calvin, is more in line

¹⁴ *Christian Doctrine*, p. 147.

¹⁵ See his *John Knox's Geneva Service Book*, 1556.

with the Oxford Movement than is always realized.¹⁶ This fresh discovery of the Reformers has done a great deal to relate modern Protestant theology to its vital classical sources and has also gone some distance to show that the great Catholic and Reformed traditions have more in common than is often imagined.¹⁷

(3) *A third feature of Protestant theology today is the change of emphasis in regard to the Bible.* Possibly the most outstanding contribution that Liberal Theology has made to the life of the Church has been in the field of Biblical criticism. That contribution has become the permanent possession of the Church. But the striking thing about Biblical scholars in this generation has been the way they have passed beyond the work of criticism to the still more essential work of Biblical theology. They have realized that Biblical criticism is not an end in itself but is intended to serve theology and that the added knowledge of the Bible's background, of the character of its writings, and of the problems of its text is to help us to understand more profoundly the eternal message which the Book contains.

A host of examples could be given of this trend amongst Biblical scholars of today both on the Continent of Europe and in Britain and America. Amongst German scholars Karl Ludwig Schmidt is one example who, at the end of the first World War, was among the more radical of the younger New Testament critics, and who in the intervening years has made a rich contribution to New Testament theology. On the English side another example is Dr. Vincent Taylor of the Methodist Church, who made a reputation as an able New Testament critic and wrote what many would regard as the standard book on the subject of Form-Criticism, but who later felt the necessity of entering the strictly theological field and has used his wide scholarship to write three outstanding books on the doctrine of the Atonement.¹⁸ The late Dr. Temple in the introduction to his expositions of St. John's Gospel informs his readers that he is familiar with the multitude of critical theories to which this Gospel has given rise, but that he does not intend to deal with them but rather to set forth the essential content of the Gospel. The time may be ripe for some scholar or group of scholars to do in the field of Biblical theology what Peake and his collaborators did in the field of Biblical criticism.¹⁹

¹⁶ *Christian Doctrine*, p. 149.

¹⁷ It has not been realized sufficiently that the Reformers were essentially men of the medieval period and that their work must be seen in the light of the developments of the later Medieval Church. It was toward these that their reform was directed, but they themselves shared many of the presuppositions of the Church of that time. They raised the essential questions, but in the liturgical field, for example, in their attempt to recover the forms of worship of the primitive Church and model the worship of the Post-Reformation Church upon them, they did not have all the evidence and did not always understand what they did have. It is here that *The Shape of the Liturgy* by Dom Gregory Dix is of such outstanding importance for the new light it throws upon the worship of the Early Church, and for the way it lifts the whole subject out of the usual Protestant versus Catholic context.

¹⁸ I regard Dr. Taylor's Preface to his *Jesus and His Sacrifice* as the classic statement of the Biblical critic's theological responsibility: 'The critic of today must live in two worlds, the academic region of his particular interests and the larger world of contemporary religion. At least once in his life he should be compelled to come out into the open and declare the bearing of his tentative results upon the larger problems of Christian belief and worship.' No scholar has more completely fulfilled his own words than Dr. Taylor.

¹⁹ Many theological commentaries of great excellence on single books of the Bible are appearing, but there is also needed a commentary on the whole Bible based upon the theological approach used in such a great work as Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. It may well be, however, that such a work can wait until a later stage in the present theological development, especially until the 'homologous' relation between the Old Testament and the New has been fully explored. (See

Within the context of these outstanding developments in contemporary Protestantism many new emphases have become apparent. Reformed theology is sounding a new note today in its doctrine of God, its doctrine of man, its conception of the Church, and in its proclamation of the Kingdom of God. In its doctrine of God there is a new sense of his sovereignty, or to use Barth's term, His 'otherness'; in its doctrine of man a new insight into the radical nature of evil; in its conception of the Church a new consciousness of its divine nature, and in its proclamation of the Kingdom of God a new understanding of its transcendence. We may conclude this study by drawing attention to these four focal points in the theological scene.

(a) Nothing has been more characteristic of the whole modern period in the history of the West than the shrinking of the conception of God in the mind and thought of modern man. God came to be identified more and more with the principle of progress and development that was thought to govern the universe. Men thought of Him chiefly as a reservoir of moral and spiritual inspiration that would enable them to achieve their goal. It is not untrue to say that frequently in the popular religious mind the everlasting God represented little more than a glorified children's nurse of the human race who was there to wait upon man and supply his needs. The austere doctrine of the Holy Fatherhood of God was interpreted in terms of that popular and romantically conceived human fatherhood which was more conspicuous for its sentimentality than for its moral fibre. The immanence of God was proclaimed with such fervour that it was forgotten that He is the Creator of the universe and the transcendent Lord of history. In a word the humanism which has been the distinguishing mark of Western civilization throughout all its great modern period became the gospel of the time and our age did really tend to think that God's chief end was to glorify man rather than man's chief end to glorify God.

This profound humanistic emphasis is by no means yet a spent force. Maritain holds that it has but entered its last stage, the stage of *anthropocentric humanism*, when man definitely and consciously makes himself his last end and seeks to build a new humanity on the basis of a radical atheism.²⁰ But so far as the responsible thinking of the Church is concerned the progress of humanism has been arrested and theology is proclaiming in a new way the utter centrality of God in His universe, as the One whom man cannot exploit for his own purposes however ideal, who alone is Lord and Judge, whose majesty, glory, and power not only excite our wonder and awe, but whose absolutely holy and transcendent will must invoke man's final submission and obedience and the deepest response of his being. The recovery of what the Bible terms 'the fear of the Lord' is one of the most significant developments in the whole of modern theology.

(b) Along with this new proclamation of God has gone, as is natural, a new insight into the radical nature of evil. Natural, since a heightened conception of God will always lead to a graver concern with sin. Perhaps it will be sufficient here to underline two points. First, that the doctrine of the Fall of man rightly

²⁰ Quoted from D. T. Niles's paper, *Theological Concerns of Our Day*.

W. J. Phythian-Adams, *The Way of At-one-ment*.) In this connexion the pioneer work of Wilhelm Vischer, the second volume of whose work, *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments*, has now appeared, has not yet received adequate attention by any English scholar, though Fr. Hebert's *The Throne of David* is outstanding in the same field.

understood is of the utmost significance for modern thinking. Brunner, in his book *Man in Revolt*, and Niebuhr in his Gifford Lectures, have broken much new ground here, but all the fruits of their thinking have not yet been garnered, as for example the implications of the Christian doctrine of man for such fields as that of psychology, of educational theory, and the field of political action. But it is significant that the classic conception of man's sinfulness is making itself felt in areas of thinking other than the strictly theological, as for example in a book of literary analysis like Norman Nicholson's *Man and Literature*, where Nicholson traces the concepts of man revealed in modern literature, and examines them, at any rate implicitly, over against the norm of the Christian view.

The second point to be mentioned in connexion with the doctrine of man is to call attention to the need for a right understanding of the much-disputed conception of total depravity. The words of Dr. Whale are relevant here as indicating the false interpretation that has often been put upon the teaching of the Reformers in this respect and as providing a modern Reformed statement of what the corruption of human nature in the total sense really means. He writes:

... in spite of the deplorable extravagance of the language of some Reformers here, notably Luther, this doctrine of Total Corruption was really insisting that the depravity which sin has produced in human nature *extends to the whole of it*, permeates human life and experience *in all its ranges*; that there is no part of man's nature, *not even his virtue*, which is unaffected by it. Total Corruption does not and never did mean that the stream of human history, instead of being crystal clear, is solid mud; but that it is impure, corrupted in every part of its course; that even the purest ideals and the most disinterested achievements of individuals and societies are ... tainted by sinful self-interest and pride.²¹

(c) The third point at which Protestant theology is speaking in new terms is in its doctrine of the Church. Protestantism has recovered again its high-churchmanship. This it need never have lost for, as we have seen, a high doctrine of the Church was central in all the thinking and teaching of the Reformers. The decline was due mainly to the secularism and humanism which affected so powerfully all the Churches during the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. Daniel Jenkins has pointed out the debt the Free Churches owe to the Anglican Communion which during this period did hold in trust a high conception of the Church.²² Yet within the Free Churches the true doctrine of the Church had never been altogether lost sight of as the writings of R. W. Dale and P. T. Forsyth alone would indicate.²³

This renewed understanding of the Church in our time is not just a repetition of the Reformers' doctrine; it is a theological emphasis which has arisen out of a fresh insight into the teaching of the New Testament and made possible by the progress of modern Biblical scholarship. It is, moreover, a movement of thought in which the Churches of the Catholic tradition are also sharing. Thus this common understanding of the Church makes possible the discussion

²¹ *Christian Doctrine*, p. 42.

²² *The Nature of Catholicity*, pp. 8-9.

²³ See in particular, Dale's *Essays and Addresses*, and Forsyth's *The Church and the Sacraments*.

of Reunion at a new level and provides a background against which an oecumenical theology may begin to emerge.

(d) Finally, Reformed theology has freed itself from the humanistic emphasis which identified the Kingdom of God with the idea of Progress. This secularization of the concept of the Kingdom has been shown to be a complete misreading of the mind of our Lord. At no point has modern New Testament scholarship performed a worthier service than in its presentation of the Kingdom as the dynamic rule of God manifested in the acts and Person of Jesus Christ. In Dr. Archibald M. Hunter's phrase the Kingdom may be defined as 'the redemptive rule of God in action'.²⁴ It is the *eschaton*, God's ultimate word, wholly transcendent in its nature yet made present and visible in the work and Person of our Lord.

This understanding of the Kingdom of God provides the Church with the real clue to history and reveals what is her true task in the world. It emphasizes that the meaning of history is not found within itself but in the action of God on the historical plane. It also emphasizes that the Church's activity is not to 'build' the Kingdom but to proclaim its reality and its implications for the total human situation. Thus the Church is saved from two sins, the sin of pride and the sin of despair; on the one hand the pride and even arrogance which Utopianism engenders, and on the other the despair which regards the human situation as hopeless and beyond repair.

ROBERT A. NELSON

THE PRIEST AND THE SIREN

THERE IS an early story of Mr. E. M. Forster's which is in the literal sense fabulous; that is, of the nature of a fable. It is told by a Mediterranean boatman to a party of English tourists, and the core of it is this. His brother, the boatman said, had once seen the Siren, and it had driven him mad. What is more, he had married a girl who also had seen her, and when the girl was about to bear a child a priest had pushed her over a cliff, because the child of such parents, if born, would bring the Siren out of the sea to sing to men and beguile them; and the Church would be destroyed, and the pagan faith come back again.

I take it that the intention of Mr. Forster's fable was to bring up the question of religion and art—and, as we all know, a very intractable question it is. He was a young man when he wrote it, not long down from Cambridge, a classical scholar, in love with antiquity, fresh from his first visit to Italy. It is the sort of question with which young men from the universities are frequently pleased to exercise their minds, but it is easy to believe that in Mr. Forster's case it was a pressing one, for the problem was in his blood. Among his collected essays in the volume *Abinger Harvest* there is one in which he describes the house on Battersea Rise, then not long demolished, which was the home of

²⁴ *The Unity of the New Testament*, p. 48.

his ancestor Henry Thornton, and the meeting-place of that remarkable group of men to whom their contemporaries gave the nickname of 'The Clapham Sect'. Besides Henry Thornton himself, they included William Wilberforce, Thomas Clarkson, Thomas Babbington, James Stephen, and Zachary Macaulay, and it was from the house on Battersea Rise that they planned and conducted the agitation which brought their countrymen under conviction of sin and led to the abolition of the slave trade. To speak of conviction of sin in this connexion is to use language which they themselves would have approved, for it is the language of the evangelical religion which was the motive-force of their brilliant political campaign.

What sort of people were they? Evangelicals, as I have said—in those days that was almost a matter of course; but to speak of them as a sect was misleading. They were indeed remarkably indifferent to denominationalism. While all of them, I think, were members of the Church of England, they had a close working alliance with the 'Dissenters', were in full sympathy with their theology, often sat under their preachers, and joined them in their prayer-meetings. In the essay to which I have referred Mr. Forster gives a description of the Clapham set which, though it has a slightly caustic flavour, is not unsympathetic, and may be taken as substantially true.

Riches, evangelical piety, genuine goodness, narrowness, complacency, integrity, censoriousness, clannishness, and a noble public spirit managed to flourish together in its ample bosom without mutual discomfort. No dancing and no cards; but heaps of food. Constant self-examination; but it was constant rather than deep. . . . Solidly religious, they give one the impression of having no sense whatever of the unseen. That they had no sense of art goes without saying, nor were they interested in literature unless it was of an intellectual or formative character.

Certainly a formidable ancestry for a man to have at his back, especially if that man is an artist. He will frequently find himself turning his head to see if they are closing in to push him over the cliff. No sense of art—no interest in literature—men in whom the moral impulse was so overmastering would be bound to feel that they must stop their ears against the Siren; there was work to be done and they could not stop to dawdle over beauty. The charge of narrowness would not greatly disturb them; they had their answer and, as they sincerely believed, their justification: *Narrow is the gate, and straitened the way*—nor did they see the matter as a choice between a lesser good and a greater one; they had a distrust of beauty which, being instinctive rather than rational, was only the more deep-seated. If to have a single eye means that you must also have a blind eye, it was a price which they were content to pay.

Blindness, and a certain distrust—that rather than active hostility is, I think, the fair description of the attitude of the Evangelicals to art. They had no overmastering impulse to push it over the cliff, but on the other hand they would not be unduly distressed, and might be even a little relieved, if it went too far and toppled down.

*Thou shalt not kill; but needst not strive
Officiously to keep alive.¹*

¹ Arthur Hugh Clough, *The Latest Decalogue*.

The fact has to be faced that between goodness and beauty, religion and art, there is a defect of sympathy which, it would seem, can never be quite got over, because it is in the grain; so much so that they are never so ill at ease as when they are trying their hardest to be friends. The *entente* is too effusively *cordiale* to be quite convincing. Churchmen like Leo the Tenth who were men of taste and munificent patrons of the arts have done at least as much injury to religion as Montanists and Puritans have done to art. We need not overstate the case; there have been puritans who were not barbarians, and there have been men of sensibility who were dedicated to goodness, but they have always been rare. It remains true that there is an incompatibility between moral earnestness and artistic sensibility which, if not irreconcilable, is in practice extremely difficult to transcend. 'I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece'—that was a favourite text of Matthew Arnold's, who also wrestled long and hard with the problem, and never reached a satisfactory conclusion.

It would be beside my purpose in this article to attempt to enter fully into this vexed question, but it cannot be left aside altogether. Few of us can be contented to make an 'either-or' choice between goodness and beauty. Each of them, we feel, has its own inalienable value and exists in its own right, and we are genuinely distressed to find that in practice they are so often mutually repelled. Why this antagonism? Charles Kingsley used to put it down to what he called Manichacism, a false opposition between flesh and spirit, and there is something in that. But though art need not be 'fleshly' in the bad sense, it is, as Milton said in speaking of poetry, of its very nature sensuous, and that no doubt is enough to bring it under suspicion. Art is rooted in sense-perception; it depends on a rich and appreciative response to colour and sound, on sensitivity to shapes and rhythms, the taste and feel of things, the relish of pleasing sensations; so much so that A. E. Housman could say that his criterion of first-rate poetry was that it sent a thrill along his spine. Such sensuousness need not be impure, but anyone can see that it may easily turn to sensuality, as when Keats drank salt water in order to heighten his relish of wine. I do not think we need look farther than this to understand the moralist's disdain of beauty and deep suspicion of art.

Yet it is as true of art as it is of nature that if you drive it out with a pitchfork it will soon come back. Indeed, not only does puritanism lead invariably to reaction, it actually contains within itself the seeds of a revival of the arts. The priest is father to the Siren and the artist is in the loins of the Puritan. I do not think it has ever been distinctly noticed that a remarkable number of men of letters in our own country have come of evangelical stock, or have been brought up in an atmosphere of evangelical strictness. Take the Clapham Sect; who could have believed that from that unlikely stock would have come the astonishing crop of writers which has, in fact, burgeoned out of it? I have already remarked that Mr. E. M. Forster is descended from Henry Thornton; he is his great-grandson. Zachary Macaulay (what a dour name it sounds!) was the father of Thomas Babbington Macaulay the historian—named for one of the other members of the sect—whose sister Hannah became the mother of Sir George Otto Trevelyan; and his son again is Mr. G. M. Trevelyan, the present Master of Trinity College—three generations of literary historians,

all writing in the grand manner. Miss Rose Macaulay, novelist, scholar, and wit, is the great-grand-daughter of Zachary Macaulay's brother. She has been good enough to furnish me with some particulars of her ancestry. Her great-grandfather was an Anglican clergyman of Leicestershire; she describes him as 'not specifically evangelical, but more or less middle'. Her maternal ancestors on the male side were all clergymen as far back as can be traced, some bishops, some deans, some vicars, and most of them writers. Her grandfather was W. J. Conybeare, the author with Dean Howson of that *Life of St. Paul* which still lingers on the bookshelves of the devout. She thinks there was not much evangelicalism in that line, but there must have been a lot of seriousness. Equally notable is the family record of the Stephens. The evangelical principles of the Abolitionist were maintained by his son Sir James S. Stephen, who was Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. In the next generation came Sir Leslie and Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, the latter a lawyer of great learning who became a judge. He was also a weighty contributor to the old *Saturday Review* and the *Pall Mall Gazette*, though he never received the recognition as a writer which his work is said by the few who are acquainted with it to deserve. Probably he was overshadowed by the great reputation of his brother Leslie, who was of course one of the most eminent men of letters of his time. It is not generally remembered that Leslie Stephen was for seven years a clergyman of the Church of England, but both he and his brother the judge became agnostics. Their sister Miss Caroline Stephen was a much respected member of the Society of Friends at Cambridge; Mr. Forster informs me that in his undergraduate days she had a high reputation for intelligence and sympathy. At the end of the line came Virginia Woolf the novelist, who was the daughter of Leslie Stephen.

This is an astonishing record. What, we may wonder, would those noble, narrow men, with their singleness of mind and their blindness to art and literature, have thought if they could have foreseen it? That they would have sorrowed over those who abandoned the Christian faith we may be sure; and it is hardly less certain that they would have been perplexed and dismayed to know that their cherished evangelical principles would have no hold over their descendants. No achievements in scholarship or literature were worth that loss of religious intensity. For to them evangelical Christianity with its note of personal assurance—'I know in whom I have believed'—was the only form of religion which had in it a salt of salvation. Nothing short of a personal faith, reached in a crisis of conversion and maintained by the unmediated operation of the Spirit of God in the believer's soul, could place him beyond the reach of doubt or the danger of falling away. The witness of the Church could never convey the same degree of assurance as the witness of the Spirit. To accept the truth of a doctrine was not the same thing as to feel the force of it. Even the best churchmanship might be nothing better than second-hand religion. Nothing could take the place of inward conviction.

This radicalism is both the strength and the weakness of evangelical religion. It confronts men with an all-or-nothing choice. What it offers is the best that religion can give, but it has nothing else to offer; it deals in absolutes. There is an inexorable dividing-line; either your eyes are open, in which case the truths of religion are luminously self-evident, or you know nothing at all; no

allowance is made for twilight states of half-perception in which men are seen as trees walking. It is therefore apt to be dubious about any conversion which is not instantaneous—"who ever loved that loved not at first sight?"—and to have little sympathy with a faith which is only able to maintain itself by clinging to outward things. Dogmas are of little value by comparison with subjective assurance; as John Wesley said: 'orthodoxy, or right opinions is, at best, but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed to be any part at all.' Neither are religious institutions to be esteemed unduly; like the Sabbath they are made for man, not man for them, and it is for him to use them as they may best serve his needs. As we have seen, the Clapham group mixed freely with dissenters and must have been regarded as most unsatisfactory churchmen. The thing that mattered was not conformity in practice or formal correctness of profession, but the life within. No doubt this is magnificent, but it is a religion for strong souls, and those who fall short of complete inward assurance may easily feel lost, since there is nothing outside themselves to serve as an ark of refuge. How desolating this can be may be seen in the case of William Cowper. We need hardly be surprised that the children of evangelical parents so often drop away from the religion in which they were brought up. It is not something that can be handed down as a heritage, for no man can have it unless he discovers it for himself; and therefore we do not find that evangelical families persist from generation to generation like catholic families.

Nevertheless, you do not get an ancestral strain out of your system by ceasing to honour your father and mother. What's bred in the bone comes out in the flesh, though often in a disguise so successful that it does not even know itself. A subjective religion fosters mental qualities which tend to persist long after the religious motive has ceased to operate, and they are the sort of qualities that must make for themselves a means of expression. Inwardness, feeling, moral awareness, the analysis of mental states, an experimental approach to questions of conduct—these are among the fruits of evangelical individualism; and are not such things the very stuff of literature? Once the compulsion of a driving sense of religious obligation is removed they are free to range at large. The impulse to 'do good' or to save souls may have ceased to operate, but sympathy and curiosity remain, and the interactions of character and circumstance, and the ways in which men and women play out their destinies, continue to be a spectacle of absorbing interest. Even a proclivity for preaching is apt to manifest itself. Men who turn against the faith of their fathers often become militant evangelists of unbelief; others who have simply dropped it because it does not mean anything to them have a way of becoming hot gospellers on behalf of some cause, or apostles of some political or economic creed. Others, of a more introspective turn, watch and report the workings of their own minds; it is their way of 'giving their experience', though to a wider audience than they would have found in a Quaker assembly or a Methodist class-meeting.

A bitter but fruitful interplay of harsh antipathies and hidden sympathies—this, perhaps, is a fair description of the relations of religion and art. Puritanism in all its forms is suspicious of the cult of beauty. This is as true of catholic puritanism as it is of the narrowest, most illiberal forms of sectarianism.

We do not always remember how persistent is the puritanic strain in the Roman Church; even Chesterton was touched with it. He once rebuked the late Dr. Horton for over-refinement, and compared the 'good taste' of modern Nonconformist worship unfavourably with the vigorous vulgarity of the Catholics—a characteristic paradox! A catholic biographer of Jean-Marie-Baptiste Vianney, the curé of Ars, speaks approvingly of his indifference to natural beauty, and adds: 'A saint . . . does not adore it (i.e. Nature), that being a weakness which he leaves to the poets. He regards it as a handbook from which he may draw comparisons for instruction, arguments which may convince men and teach them to pray better.' Where the moral impulse is overmastering it will brook no rival, and if it comes to a choice it will even prefer ugliness to beauty as being less seductive. This, it would seem, is a pretty constant tendency, if not a universal one; it is part of that mortification of the flesh on which religion insists that it should call for the denial even of innocent delights, lest their indulgence should put conscience off its guard. As long as the religious motive is uppermost men will submit to this harsh but saving discipline, but sooner or later they will begin to question it and reaction will set in.

Yet even in the reaction we may trace an underlying continuity. It is an interesting thing to notice that, in spite of all the hard things that Macaulay the historian said about the Puritans, he has always been, on the whole, the favourite historian of their descendants the English Nonconformists. They are able to enjoy the joke about bear-baiting being disapproved, 'not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators', because it is family joke, and they feel that Macaulay is one of the family in spite of himself. They know that he was in full sympathy with the Puritan struggle for political and religious liberty; they appreciate the vigour of his moral judgements and the way in which he followed moral clues in his interpretation of history and even in his criticism of literature; and they perceive that, in spite of what he said about 'the brayings of Exeter Hall', his own brand of rhetoric was equally robust. He was a civilized and educated Puritan, and Puritanism was the nursery of the Whig school of history.

Still more remarkable are the strands of heredity running through the Stephen family. We have seen that both Leslie Stephen and his brother Fitzjames were unable, in mature life, to accept the religious convictions in which they had been reared; their evangelical father would have said, no doubt, that they had never been 'soundly converted'. Their sister turned aside into the bypath of Quakerism. Yet the texture of their breeding is woven through their work. R. H. Hutton described Fitzjames as 'a Calvinist with the bottom knocked out'. He had the same high sense of responsibility for what he did with his life, the same habit of brooding over the mysteries of human destiny, and perhaps a greater strictness in matters of personal conduct. Even Calvin unbent so far as sometimes to play at bowls—and on a Sunday too!—but Fitzjames Stephen scorned every kind of relaxation or pleasure. Leslie was more a man of the world, but he too, in his literary and biographical studies, was constantly preoccupied with moral issues. Both the brothers paid grateful tribute to their evangelical upbringing. Writing of Macaulay, Fitzjames says:

Lord Macaulay's father was something better than a man of genius, for he sacrificed not only his time and labour, but his fortune, and as far as calumny can destroy it, his reputation, to labours of love in which he bore the burden while others reaped the glory. It is no extraordinary thing that men of ability should be born and bred in such a society.

Leslie Stephen, again, writes thus of the rigorous teachers who had seized his youth (to adopt Matthew Arnold's phrase):

I am content to say that though my childish reverence for certain members of the sect was necessarily of the instinctive variety, it does not seem misplaced to my later judgement. I have met no men in later years who seem to me to have a higher sense of duty or deeper domestic affections. The essential Puritan may survive, as the case of Carlyle sufficiently showed, when all his dogmas have evaporated, and I confess that, rightly or wrongly, he is a person for whom I have profound respect and much sympathy.²

When we come to Virginia Woolf, in the next generation, it might seem at first sight that the Puritan strain had quite died out. In her we have the pure artist, aloof from the world, serving no cause, quietly disdainful of the strife and clamour of public debate, only asking for 'a room of one's own' in which to get on with a self-chosen pursuit without interruption. There is even something slightly inhuman about such detachment in the midst of an awful crisis in human affairs. Yet can we not trace the toughness of moral fibre which enabled her to maintain this attitude for so long to the independence and self-sufficiency of the Puritan breed from which she came? In the end she broke under the strain, and who can wonder at it? Yet, whether we approve of it or not, we can hardly fail to feel that there was something heroic in her determination not to be diverted from the work which she had chosen for herself. She was an introvert, not much interested in what happened to the people about whom she wrote, but passionately absorbed in the study of what went on in their minds, and exerting all her skill in depicting it with delicate and minute exactness. It is perhaps not merely fanciful to suppose that in all this she owed much to the constant self-examination of the evangelical and Quaker ancestors whose beliefs she had discarded, but whose mental habits were the raw material of her art.

I have confined myself to an examination of hereditary influences in the descendants of one particular group of people, because they seem to illustrate in a striking fashion the complicated play of enmities and sympathies which makes up the tangled bond between religion and art. Evangelical religion especially is supposed to be inimical to art, and on the surface, and for good reasons which I have sought to bring out, no doubt it is; but at a deeper level it is seen to be a breeding-ground of the very thing it so deeply distrusts. I use the word art in the large sense, to cover literature and even historical writing, remembering that Clio is numbered among the Muses. The insistence of evangelical religion on the validity of 'experience', on the need of deep personal verification of religious truth, fosters a habit of mind which also quite naturally finds expression in art. It is therefore not surprising that, in spite of their frequent estrangement, they are recognizable as 'sisters under the skin'.

W. S. HANDLEY JONES

² I owe these two quotations to my friend the Rev. F. Brompton Harvey.

MEDICINE AND THE MINISTRY

THE TERM 'ministers of religion' appears to suggest that the one and only interest of the Ministry is religion; that is, that the ministerial vocation has to do exclusively with the souls of men. Nowadays, however, it has become an accepted fact that the soul of man is affected by his mind. Psychology has forced its way into religion as surely as salvation. Indeed, the one is linked up with the other. Consequently, within the ranks of the Ministry psychologists have arisen and large claims have been made for the introduction of psychotherapy into the Church's many activities. But what is the work of the Ministry in regard to men's bodies?

It is not a little strange that while the importance of the soul, and now of the mind, is recognized, the body of man, so far as the Ministry is concerned, suffers neglect. Or can it be that ministers of religion have, in the past, regarded such a concern as outside their sphere, something that belongs to another profession with which it would be discourteous and dangerous to interfere? This may well be so. Yet in the missionary field it is largely taken for granted that some medical training of ministers is an essential part of their equipment. It is true that fully qualified doctors are sent to the mission field, but in many parts of that field no such doctor is available and the ordinary minister has to act in a medical capacity. Yet at home no training whatsoever in ordinary medicine is given to ministers. That is somewhat curious, for very few ministers are without interest in bodily ailments and, even if not technically, in medicine. Their work brings them so frequently into touch with sick people, and they so often hear of the physical disabilities of those whom they visit, that this is not surprising. Moreover, they must be ever watchful of their own health. Medicine, therefore, is an inescapable interest. Yet none are trained in it and, apart from a little homely advice or sharing of information about similar disabilities, no guidance is given and no remedy offered.

Ought ministers of religion to be trained in medicine and be allowed to recommend remedies for ailments? Can the effectiveness of the Ministry be widened by its ministers possessing certain medical knowledge? If a straw indicates the way the wind is blowing it may well be that a question set in a recent examination paper for candidates for the Ministry also indicates the need of looking at this matter. In that question candidates were asked to state what they knew about M and B and Penicillin—a rather surprising question for men who were seeking to become curers of souls! The question may have been asked, of course, simply to test alertness of mind toward modern discoveries. Nevertheless, such a question could not fail to arouse some interest in the ways of medicine.

The great John Wesley made no bones about his interest in bodily ailments and his remedies are for all to read. It is true that he mainly alternated between the medical practitioner and what might be called faith-healing (the Kingswood schoolmistress, 'having found no help from all the medicines she had taken', was taken out of the danger of death in a few days by 'one remedy more'—prayer), but he had his own remedies also. He was a great believer in apple-tea and ipecacuanha was often in demand. John Wesley knew quite

well how surely the body affected the mind and soul. His 'cures', of course, were unscientific and medical men today smile at them. But so also do they smile at some of the remedies of the old leaders in their own profession. Even so, many of our newer remedies appear to be the same old thing under another name. Indeed, medicine, like everything else, being subject to fashion, we find doctors themselves often changing their minds. Mumps, until recently, demanded three weeks for the isolation period. Now, it is a fortnight. George A. Birmingham (Canon Hanneý), in his autobiography, *Pleasant Places*, tells of a game of football at school when all the players were suffering from mumps, yet he could not remember that any harm came to any of them. 'Someday, perhaps, the medical profession will discover that football is good for mumps. One never knows with doctors when, in search for the novel, they will go back to something very old indeed, something long denounced as barbarous.'

Charles Haddon Spurgeon, like Wesley, was a great one for offering remedies and for giving advice about health—especially to students. Added to his concern for the salvation of men's souls was at least one text-book—though popularly written—on *Diseases of the Throat and Lungs*. This subject, of course, holds a natural interest for the preacher and Spurgeon gave his students the benefit of his reading as well as the knowledge of his own practices. It is true that he recommended that a good physician should, if at all possible, always be consulted, but in case that could not be done he had his own remedies ready.

Never purchase Marsh-mallow rock, Cough-no-More lozenges, Pulmonic Wafers, Horehound, Ipecacuanha. . . . They may serve your turn for a time . . . but they ruin the throat by their laxative qualities. If you wish to improve your throat take a good share of pepper—good Cayenne pepper, and other astringent substances, as much as your stomach can bear. . . .

Then, as though afraid of what we moderns call 'plugging', he adds: 'Common sense teaches you that astringents must be useful.' Even so, he proceeds to disclose his own practice of having a little glass of Chili vinegar and water in front of him, whenever he preached in Exeter Hall, as a help for a weary throat. But his 'sovereign remedy' was a basin of beef-tea, 'as strong with pepper as can be borne'. Spurgeon believed in pepper—maybe in more senses than one.

In all his advice, Spurgeon protested that he was not qualified to practise medicine, but not before he had said a strong word about teeth and indulged in a startling judgement about bronchitis. Of the latter he makes the astonishing assertion that it is due to 'the wearing of a hole in that part of the throat which is most exercised', and which condition comes about by using the same tone of voice! If a preacher will indulge in speaking in a monotone 'he will suffer from bronchitis'. This statement, while providing a pretty puzzle for the many quiet and almost voiceless sufferers of the time, does at least show that the soul-savers of the past were inclined to be body-savers, too.

Wesley's remedies, Spurgeon's instructions, and, among the more modern, Cannon Hanneý's scorn of the specialist (Canon Hanneý even doubted whether the more hygienic houses of a Local Authority prevented disease as well as the

smoke-filled (peat) cottages of the Irish peasant), all indicate that both the Free and Anglican Churches have had their tyros in the realm of medicine. If Spurgeon saw the necessity of being interested in the matter on account of his students, Wesley was interested because of his believers. Canon Hanney's interest, however, seems to be more thorough-going still—a plea for the uninitiated who rely on experiment to the disadvantage of the trained who are often mistaken in their theories.

Training, in all spheres of study, is now rigorously demanded. If the Ministry is not to be trusted in medicine on account of unskilled judgement, ought training to be given? Ought ministers of religion to be medically trained up to the point of being able to give advice about the common cold, or to 'take a pulse', or to offer a recipe for stomach trouble; and to do this as a man who knows the body as much as he knows the mind and soul? Some of the Fathers appeared to glimpse something of this necessity from afar.

Everybody knows that the easiest approach to a man's mind and soul is through his body. Men are much more aware of their bodies than they are of their minds and souls. They are more acutely aware of the 'wrongness' of their bodies than of anything else. For that very reason, most of them make the mistake of imagining that if they are right there they are right everywhere else. And here probably is the strongest argument for the medical training of ministers. The medical man, as a rule, gets a man right in his body and leaves it at that. The healthy body is the end of his ministrations. But the minister would not only not leave it at that; he would be given the opportunity, in a special way, of leading the patient to higher stages. Once confidence had been placed in him regarding the health of the body, added confidence might be placed in him for the mind and the soul.

It may be thought perhaps that this would better be done by raising up an order of faith-healers—men who make no pretensions to medical knowledge but who can invoke healing powers by faith. The answer to this is that although many people would be reached in such a way, the number would not be nearly as large as those reached by the ordinary way of medicine. No doubt many people would be helped by the faith-healer and the Churches would correspondingly benefit, but many would remain sceptical. That may be true, to some extent, of medical treatment, but hardly in the same way. The vast majority of people can only be reached by physical means and by visible signs. If the ordinary man, at any time, realizes that for his good he must have faith, he prefers that it should come in surreptitiously so that he is not made aware of it. He is shy of anything that goes beyond what he can see and understand. Give him a thorough diagnosis or a bottle of medicine and he will have faith alongside of it. But not easily will he have faith without it. He demands the visible means. Yet once that has been given, he might well be ready to receive, and from the same man, advice about his mind and soul, and even take the remedies.

In addition to all this there is the very important matter, often overlooked, of the effect of the body on the mind and soul (or spirit) of man. Everybody acknowledges that the body does not live to itself alone, yet, in practice, this obvious truth is often ignored. About the incidence of this matter the Church has a lot to learn. How many trustees' meetings would have been saved from

disastrous decisions as well as from unholy rancour if only the minister had possessed some medical authority to keep at home men who were over-tired, devitalized, and liverish! But we persist in allowing unfit men to come to jaundiced judgements not because they, of malice aforethought, desire to do so, but because they are shockingly unwell and cannot help themselves. And by having its most serious meetings (annual) in the winter, often during the worst period of the country's unpredictable weather, the Church has contributed to this unhappy situation. Why not have such meetings in the summer when the sun is shining and people are so much easier to get on with? Even children, we are told, register in their tempers whether the wind blows from the north or the south.

The late Sir Hugh Walpole put lots of people into his debt by writing two short stories—*The Dyspeptic Critic* and *The Man who Lost his Identity*. The first dealt with a change of environment and the second with a little elementary psychological experiment. The men of the stories were astoundingly changed, one by an enforced holiday and the other by suggestion. Being changed for the better they naturally behaved and thought better. Such an approach to men—whether hard, fault-finding, and cruel as the dyspeptic critic was; or conceited, overbearing, and egotistical as the man who lost his identity—is by far the easiest and often the most successful. To tell a man, whose physical condition is such that he cannot overcome his scurvy judgements, that all he needs to do is to pray about it, is like placing a pebble to stem a stream—it cannot be done. If he restrains himself in one place he will explode in another. And to say to a man who is opinionated and egotistical that he needs to cultivate the grace of humility is like asking a child to stop a runaway horse—it is impossible. Many people do not need, first of all, to pray: they need medical advice or psychological treatment. A man who, before he is ordered away for a holiday, thinks the whole world is going to pieces, that everything conspires to oppose him and that life is hardly worth while living—a man, in short, who is 'gey ill to live with'—is often a far different man when he returns. The man who scowls at you in winter is in every way likely to smile at you in summer. In all sorts of ways, therefore, the minister with a working medical knowledge, as well as a working psychological knowledge, could prove helpful to his people, to religion, and the Church.

It is not now denied that psychological treatment in religious practice has established itself. It has not done so without much advocacy. It has justified itself by unquestionable good results. It may well be that if the Church now moved on to physiological practice, greater good still would yet be gained. And even if the common ills of life were relieved by the many hundreds of ministers of religion using a properly instructed medical knowledge, there would still remain a necessary demand for the more fully qualified medical practitioner. The Church must not encourage anything in the nature of quacks, but neither should it be blind to the far more efficient service which could be given and the greater results that could be gained by a ministry intelligently informed about the general ailments of the people.

A rejoinder to all this would naturally take the line of the dangers involved, and at once it must be admitted that there are dangers. But there are dangers in most things. Given proper safeguards—the necessity, for instance, to call

in a specialist or to report to a medical practitioner any serious case of complication—the dangers are not insuperable. In any case, many ministers are practising their amateur psychology without let or hindrance, and it may be much easier to hurt the mind than to hurt the body.

T. W. BEVAN

Notes and Discussions

MATTHEW'S LOGIA: AN ESSAY IN DEDUCTION

A NEW BOOK on the literary origins of our First Gospel¹ is bound to be of interest to New Testament students, especially when written by so careful and competent a scholar as G. D. Kilpatrick appears to be. Whether the results are quite commensurate with the painstaking labour which the author has bestowed on his task is another question. On the controversial issues which have centred about the Gospel in recent years, Mr. Kilpatrick's conclusions are as follows:

- (1) St. Matthew himself had nothing to do with the First Gospel: it is strictly pseudonymous.
- (2) It was written about the last decade of the first century.
- (3) Its author probably used three written sources, Mark, 'Q', and 'M'—the latter for his peculiar discourse material, but not for his peculiar narrative.
- (4) But most of his material had previously been in use (for lectionary and expository purposes) in the liturgy of the Church to which he belonged and for which the Gospel was written: here, probably, he found his peculiar narrative.
- (5) This Church was probably a prosperous Syrian community, perhaps at a Phoenician seaport—not at Antioch, or there would have been more traces of Pauline influence.
- (6) The author was influenced by the hostility of the Jewish (Pharisaic) Synagogue to Jewish Christians about this time.
- (7) Papias's famous paragraph about Matthew's *λόγια* is worthless. The *λόγια* was not 'Q', nor was it a 'testimony book': on the contrary, Papias, in using the word, meant our Gospel—only what he says about it is quite wrong.

With some of these conclusions we need not seriously quarrel. The date for the Gospel, in its present form, is not unreasonable; and Mr. Kilpatrick may be right in assuming that parts of it had been in use for liturgical purposes before they were written down. But the suggestion that the author belonged to a Phoenician Church seems rather far-fetched: why not a Church in Palestine itself? Mr. Kilpatrick quotes from numerous authorities (some of whom may be a little *démodés*), and shows a wide reading on the subject. But there is no mention of Lagrange's monumental work on St. Matthew's Gospel, nor of his theories regarding its origin, which unfortunately seem to be too little known in this country.

But the astonishing conclusion about Papias really seems to cast doubt on Mr. Kilpatrick's critical acumen, and deserves to be examined in detail.

First, as to Papias's date. Mr. Kilpatrick, by inference, dates the *Ἐξηγήσεις* about A.D. 135. This would be accepted by many scholars, and some have placed it even

¹ *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, by G. D. Kilpatrick (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1946).

later. But I would venture to suggest that even 135 is considerably too late. He was, no doubt, a 'contemporary' of Justin and Polycarp; but this does not imply that he lived to anything like so late a date as they. Irenaeus calls him ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, which suggests a fairly long interval between the activities of Papias and himself. The Anti-Marcionite Prologues (rather earlier than Irenaeus) speak of him as a disciple of the Apostle John; and no one reading the preface to his Ἐξηγήσεις (as quoted by Eusebius), enlarging, as it does, on his associations with those who had known the Apostles, and even on one or two of the 'Lord's disciples' as being still 'a living and continuing voice'—can doubt that it seems to imply a date not later than the early years of the second century—not later than A.D. 110–20. The information which he quotes as having been given him about Matthew's Logia may have been still earlier, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that his informant had not seen the Gospel in its present form.

Let us quote the actual paragraph, preceded by the statement about Mark—for the two must be read in conjunction:

And this the Elder used to say: 'Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately as many things as he remembered, whether things said or things done by the Lord—not, however, in order. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed with Him, but afterwards, as I said, with Peter, who adapted his teachings to the needs (of his hearers), but not as making an ordered history of the Lord's Logia. So that Mark made no mistake in thus writing down some things as he remembered them; for he took care of one matter—not to omit anything which he heard, and not to falsify anything.'

These things are narrated by Papias about Mark. But about Matthew, these things are said: 'Matthew composed the Logia in the Hebrew dialect (Aramaic), and each interpreted them as he was able.'

It is clear from the statement about Mark that Papias used the word Logia as covering things *done* as well as things *said* by the Lord; although the use of the term as a kind of title may well suggest that Matthew's work consisted largely of sayings or discourse, and his use of that term instead of 'Gospel' seems to be confirmatory evidence of his comparatively early date.

Mr. Kilpatrick's observations about Papias are not quite easy to follow. He starts by saying that Papias's

statement at once raises certain difficulties. The first of these is the meaning of the term τὰ λόγια. From his context it is quite clear that Eusebius took it to mean the Gospel according to St. Matthew. . . . This interpretation seems the most satisfactory one. . . . Hence the presumption is that Papias by τὰ λόγια means our Gospel. Only if this proves improbable will other interpretations be considered.

Mr. Kilpatrick's reference to Eusebius can hardly be accepted literally: presumably what he means is that Eusebius took the Logia to be the *Aramaic original* of our Gospel. Then he proceeds to argue on the usual lines that our book is not a translation; and that it is not by Matthew the Apostle, since 'it depends on two, or more probably three, written sources', in the handling of which 'it shows the features of a later period. These difficulties', he proceeds, 'force us back to our alternative that by τὰ λόγια Papias meant some document other than our Gospel'. He then proceeds to examine what he calls the 'two main suggestions' which have been made.

The first is that the Logia was the original document which is usually called 'Q'. Mr. Kilpatrick assumes one particular variety of this theory, viz.: that there were a number of Greek translations of this Aramaic document ('translations of varying

achievement', as he expresses it), one of which was used in both our Matthew and our Luke; and he goes on to ask how it is that these Evangelists independently used the same one of these translations, while of the others there is no sign? But surely Mr. Kilpatrick is here knocking down a bogey of his own creation. It is by no means necessary to suppose that Matthew and Luke used the same recension of 'Q'—indeed the evidence is to the contrary. If (say) the writer of our Matthew used the original Aramaic, and translated it under the influence of the Greek translation which Luke used, some at least of the resemblances and differences between the 'Q' matter of Matthew and Luke might be explained. Or the supposedly numerous Greek translations may have influenced one another. But it is not impossible that the sentence—'each translated them as he was able'—refers for the most part to individual attempts to understand the Aramaic, and not to written documents.

The second suggestion is that τὰ λόγια was 'a kind of testimony book'. And here Mr. Kilpatrick seems to be on surer ground in the arguments he adduces against it. But one cannot but think him unfair when he says that 'the theories that by τὰ λόγια either "Q" or a testimony book is meant are attempts to account for the title of the Gospel and to save the credit of Papias'. Or, in other words, 'to maintain the truth of Papias's statement and to relate it to the documentary hypothesis'. And then he appears to hark back to and accept the original view that Papias really had in mind our present Gospel; but to maintain that he, or his informant, was altogether wrong in what he said about it.

We may readily grant that if Papias meant by τὰ λόγια an Aramaic original of our Gospel as we have it in Greek, he *was* wrong. And we may go farther, and say that Eusebius, in quoting Papias's statement as if it explained the origin of our Gospel, and yet failing to relate the various 'translations' to the work of supreme genius which we call St. Matthew's Gospel—is showing a singular lack of historical, literary, and critical sense.

But can Papias, or his informant, have possibly meant our present Gospel? If 'each translated (interpreted) the Logia as he was able', there was obviously no outstanding—no 'authorized'—translation into Greek. But our Gospel is an outstanding Greek work, which was known to Ignatius as early as A.D. 115, and was used by many Christian Churches as 'authorized' (so far as any Christian writing was 'authorized' at that time) well before the middle of the second century. Could Papias, speaking of translations of the Logia, have failed to tell us how one of these translations became transmuted into our εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον, if he had the latter in mind? In fact, allowing an early date for the statement, it is more reasonable to suppose that Papias, or at least his informant, did not know our book. If Papias knew it, but not his informant, then he lies under the same censure as Eusebius for not attempting to explain the transition—unless, indeed, Eusebius has omitted the relative part of Papias's story.

It has often been asserted—and again by Mr. Kilpatrick—that all Patristic statements associating the Apostle Matthew with an early Aramaic document derive from Papias. This seems very questionable, for some of these statements give further information which appears to have come from other sources. Here are some of them:

IRENAEUS (c. A.D. 180): 'Matthew published a writing of the Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel and founding the Church in Rome.'

ORIGEN (c. 230) says, concerning the 'four Gospels which alone are undisputed in the Church of God', that 'the first is that according to Matthew, once a tax-gatherer, afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, who gave it to converts from Judaism, writing it in Hebrew characters.'

EUSEBIUS himself (c. 325), after remarking that Matthew and John, alone of those who were associated with the Lord in His earthly Ministry, have left written memoirs, goes on to say that 'Matthew, having first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go elsewhere, gave them his Gospel written in their own tongue, that by the written word he might fill the void occasioned by his departure.'

And finally the scholarly JEROME (c. 375) says that 'Matthew the tax-gatherer, who was also called Levi, first of all published his Gospel in Judea, in the Hebrew language, especially for the sake of those of the Jews who had believed in Jesus, and were preserving the truth of the Gospel under the shadow of the Law.'

These later statements do not, it is true, add much of importance to that of Papias; but the general effect is that there was a universal impression among those most likely to know that Matthew the Apostle wrote some kind of Gospel at an early date, and that he wrote it in Aramaic—the current form of Hebrew. Of course all the writers quoted knew our Gospel; and it seems rather incredible that there should not have been some relationship between Matthew's Aramaic Logia mentioned by Papias, the Aramaic Gospel attributed by other writers to Matthew, and our Gospel. That relationship could not, as I hope has been shown, have been one of identity, in the sense that the Logia was the precise Aramaic original of ours. And the only reasonable alternative seems to be that the writer of our Matthew incorporated, or at least used, the Logia along with other matter. In our Gospel, as Mr. Kilpatrick would argue, at least three, and possibly four, strains are distinctly discernible. The first is the Marcan matter. The second is a strain, largely but not entirely discourse, which is more or less similar to parts of Luke. The third is a strain, also both narrative and discourse, peculiar to our first Gospel: it includes the Nativity stories; such incidents as Peter's walking on the water, the finding of the stater in the fish's mouth, the hailing of Peter as the rock on which the Church would be built, Pilate's wife's dream and his washing of his hands, the guarding of the Tomb and the bribery of the guard, and the post-resurrection appearance in Galilee; and lastly certain important parables, such as the Ten Virgins, the Unmerciful Servant, the Two Sons, the Labourers in the Vineyard, and the Last Judgement. The fourth strain (if it is to be regarded as independent) consists of the Old Testament 'proof-texts'.

Which of these, excluding the first, may we attribute to the Logia? We have already agreed, with Mr. Kilpatrick, that the fourth could not alone have constituted the Logia—if for no other reason than that the proof-texts would be pointless without the narratives with which they are associated: this is not to say, however, that at least some of them may have been included in the Logia.

As between the other two strains, we must remember that the Logia seems, from Papias's statement, to have been a fairly well-known work, and that several attempts had been made to translate it into Greek. We may therefore expect to find traces of it in other early Christian documents; and the fact that there are considerable non-Markan parts of Luke which are similar to our Matthew suggests at once that these may derive from the Logia. In the similarity there are differences. Some of these, as above suggested, may be due to Luke having used one of the 'unauthorized' translations referred to by Papias. Others are more difficult to account for, but may be due to the writer of our Matthew, or to Luke, having 'conflated' the Logia with another source in the passages in question. The order, too, is different. In our Matthew there is an obvious 'grouping' of sayings which relate to cognate subjects. In Luke, the sayings are much more scattered. If this grouping had existed in the document which Luke used, there is no reason why Luke should not have adopted it; and it seems clear, therefore, that in this respect Luke is nearer to the

original. And we may reasonably assume that where there are other differences between Matthew and Luke in their common matter (as, for instance, in the Beatitudes), Luke again is nearer to the original.

We are not entitled to conclude that matter which is peculiar to Matthew does not appear in the Logia, simply because it does not appear in Luke. Luke no doubt made a selection, and his selection may well have been more restricted than that of the writer of our first Gospel. As illustrating Luke's methods, one may point out that he does not include the Marcan account of the Feeding of the Four Thousand or of the Anointing at Bethany—seeming to have avoided the duplication of similar incidents. Again, he omits the account of the Syro-Phoenician woman, possibly because it might have been misunderstood by the Gentiles for whom he was writing. But one thinks that Luke, had he known them, would have been eager to include such Matthean parables as those mentioned above, which are so entirely consonant with the spirit of his Gospel. Hence we may take it that they did not appear in the Logia, and that the writer of our Matthew obtained some of his matter from a source peculiar to himself—just, in fact, as Luke did.

It is by no means axiomatic that everything in our Matthew which bears a similarity to Mark necessarily derives from Mark. Many scholars, of whom Lagrange is perhaps the foremost, believe that the Apostles, in their preaching and teaching soon began to use a more or less common oral tradition or *catechesis*. The original order may have soon become obscure—else Luke would not have emphasized his care to write *in order*, nor would Papias's 'Elder' have emphasized the absence of *order* in Mark. But the various incidents of our Lord's Ministry, and especially His words, would probably be narrated in the oral tradition in a common form. To this extent the exponents of 'Form History' are no doubt right in thinking that the oral tradition existed, when the Gospels came to be written, in the form of pericopes or sections, rather than in a continuous narrative. Especially is it rash to assume that the writer of our Matthew is using Mark when, in narrating incidents which Mark also narrates, he adopts a different order, or departs from Mark in any noticeable detail. Many scholars maintain that the Logia (or 'Q') cannot have contained any Passion narrative, because (apart from incidents peculiar to himself) Matthew follows Mark with great fidelity. But it is precisely here that the oral tradition might be expected to retain its standard common form most closely, especially if we are right in concluding from 1 Corinthians 11²⁶ that the Passion narrative was rehearsed on each occasion of the Lord's Supper. Nor is it the fact that there are no divergences from Mark in this narrative which are common to Matthew and Luke, and which accordingly suggest that they may have been using a common non-Markan source such as the Logia.

For instance, in the story of Peter's denial, Mark alone of the Synoptists speaks of the cock crowing *twice*, both in the warning to Peter and in the *dénouement*: Matthew and Luke speak of one crowing only. In the story of the arrest, Mark does not mention that our Lord spoke to Judas when the latter kissed Him. Matthew gives us the rather cryptic: 'Friend . . . for which thou art come.' Luke has: 'Judas, with a kiss dost thou betray the Son of Man?' Like many others, I feel convinced that it is in the *kiss* that Matthew's relative clause refers; and although the Revised Version fills in: 'Friend, [do that] for which thou art come', I prefer something like Wellhausen's: '[Dost thou kiss Me for the purpose] for which thou art come'—which is practically the same as Luke's sentence. In regard to the questions which led to Peter's denial, Mark says that the same maid that asked the first also asked the second: Matthew and Luke say that another person asked the second. In our Lord's reply to the High Priest's adjuration, Matthew's: σὺ εἶπας, and Luke's: ὑμεῖς λεγέτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι, may be the equivalent of Mark's: ἐγὼ εἶμι, though this seems doubtful; but

Matthew and Luke agree in including a note of time (ἀπ' ἄρτι in one case and ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν in the other) which Mark omits. In the mockery by the High Priest's satellites, Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in completing the demand 'Prophecy' by the words 'who is he that struck thee'. And though Luke's story (in Acts) of Ananias's fate differs somewhat from Matthew's, there is sufficient agreement to justify in thinking that both stories derive ultimately from a common non-Markan source. All this is apart from the obvious and recognized instances where Matthew and Luke contain narrative passages which do not appear in Mark, and which may well have been obtained from the Logia. Perhaps the most striking of these are the story of the healing of the Centurion's boy and the detailed story of the Temptation. It is incredible that the author of the Logia, not knowing Mark (for this seems certain), should have *happened* to include those stories only which Mark did not include. And further, if we grant that the Logia consisted mainly of discourse and sayings, it must still be remembered that many of the sayings could not be understood without some knowledge of the incidents which gave rise to them.

We now come to another important consideration for our study—the existence in the early centuries of our era of the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews', and its probable nature. It is of course no longer extant, but we know a good deal about it, especially from Jerome. The book is said to have been shorter by about one-eighth than our Matthew; but it seems to have contained a good deal of additional matter. A detailed account of what we know of it appears in Dr. M. R. James's *Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 1-8. Jerome at one time thought that it was our Gospel in the original Aramaic, but he afterwards modified this view. The following particulars of its contents seem to warrant special mention:

- (1) A statement that our Lord was taken by the Holy Spirit to Mount Thabor and to Jerusalem—showing that, like Matthew and Luke, it contained a detailed story of the Temptation.
- (2) A variation of the Lord's Prayer ('our bread of the morrow give us this day'), showing that, again like Matthew and Luke, it contained this prayer.
- (3) An additional detail in the story of the man with the withered hand—a story which appears in all the Synoptists.
- (4) Part, at least, of the Sermon on the Mount, for we are told that it did *not* contain the words 'without cause', which some MSS. insert in Matthew 5²²; and again that it made additions after Matthew 7⁶ and 7⁷.
- (5) Probably the charge to the Apostles, for we are told that it read 'be wiser than serpents' instead of 'wise as serpents'. A version of this charge appears in all the Synoptists, but Matthew alone gives this injunction.
- (6) Probably the incident of the Baptist's question to our Lord, our Lord's reply, and His testimony to the Baptist; for we are told that it reads 'the Kingdom of Heaven is ravished' (or plundered) instead of 'suffers violence'. Matthew and Luke give the incident, but not Mark.
- (7) The passage, so Johanne in spirit, which appears in Matthew 11²⁵⁻⁷ and Luke 10²¹⁻³, but not in Mark; for we are told that the 'Jewish' reads εὐχαριστῶ instead of ἐξομολογοῦμαι.
- (8) The passage against seeking for signs (Matthew 12³⁸⁻⁴² and Luke 11²⁹⁻³²); for we are told of a small variant which the 'Jewish' has here.
- (9) Peter's confession (which appears in all our Gospels); for we are told that the 'Jewish' reads 'Simon son of John' instead of 'Simon Bariona' (Matthew 16¹⁷).
- (10) The passage about forgiveness (Matthew 18¹⁵⁻¹⁷, 21-2 and Luke 17³⁻⁴); for we are told of an addition which it makes here.
- (11) The incident of the Rich Young Man; for it gives additional particulars. (This incident appears in all the Synoptists; but it is interesting to note that the

'Jewish' gives the young man's question in the same form as Matthew—'Master, what good thing shall I do', and not in that of Mark and Luke—'Good Master, what shall I do.'

(12) The cleansing of the Temple; for we are told of an addition which it makes about a light shining from the Lord's eyes.

(13) A variant of the Parable of the Talents (Pounds?). Each servant received one talent (compare Luke's account), but whereas one traded with the talent and one hid it, the third spent it in riotous living.

(14) Our Lord's statement at the Last Supper: 'With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you'—which Luke alone of our Gospels contains.

(15) The story of Peter's denial; for we are told that 'he denied and swore and cursed'. These items, and a reference to our Lord's prayer: 'Father forgive them' (cf. Luke), make it pretty certain that it contained the general story of the Passion.

(16) The story of the Guard at the Tomb, in the form: 'And he (Pilate) delivered to them armed men, that they might sit over against the cave and guard it night and day.' Matthew alone of our Gospels includes this story.

(17) In the post-Resurrection appearances, besides an appearance to James, the Lucan statement that when the Lord appeared to the disciples on Easter Day, He said to them: 'Lo, feel Me, and see that I am not a bodiless spirit.'

From this analysis it seems clear that the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' was a Gospel in the proper sense, containing an account of our Lord's words and deeds, and of His Passion and Resurrection. In many of the examples given it agrees with Matthew and Luke, but not with Mark. In some cases it agrees with all three Synoptists, and in one or two cases with Matthew alone or Luke alone. The only reasonable conclusion seems to be that it derived from the same source as our Matthew, at least as regards the matter which he shares with Luke, and possibly as regards other matter. In other words, it seems probable that the Logia has, in one line of descent, been a main source of our Matthew and Luke; and, in another line of descent, a main source of the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews'. Turning this argument round, we may conclude that Matthew's Logia was, as Lagrange believes, a veritable Gospel, based probably on the original Apostolic *catechesis*; but also containing much additional matter embodying our Lord's sayings and discourses, which may have been the result of notes kept by Matthew the tax-gatherer himself. And I think we may further conclude, as against Mr. Kilpatrick, that our first Gospel was called the Gospel according to St. Matthew, because it owes so much to Matthew's Logia.

F. J. BROWN

THE PERENNIAL PHILOSOPHY

Aldous Huxley in Search of His Soul

IT IS NOW ten years since Aldous Huxley wrote *Ends and Means*, a thought-provoking book about present-day problems, urging the necessity of spiritual discipline as the only way to their solution. This volume was preceded by a novel, *Eyeless in Gaza*, containing a long passage taken from *The Dark Night of the Soul*, by St. John of the Cross, together with references to Pacifism suggesting what was likely to be the writer's future preoccupation. In the chapter relevant to Mysticism in *Ends and Means*, the Franciscan ideal of 'the Stripped life'—'the non-attached life' as Huxley has named it—was proclaimed as the first essential in the search for God. Aldous

Huxley was at this date (1936) getting into his spiritual stride. The subject of interior prayer is pursued in his next book, *Grey Eminence*, but is mainly concerned in showing the utter incompatibility of the life of the spirit with the interests of Power Politics, which Father Joseph tried to combine, as political agent for Cardinal Richelieu. But this historical work is also important in bringing to our notice the animadversions of Huxley on Christocentric mysticism, such as finds its purest and simplest expression perhaps, in the Lady Julian of Norwich and St. Francis. Huxley is against any attachment to the historical person of Jesus.

Now comes *The Perennial Philosophy*—'the metaphysic that recognizes a divine Reality substantial to the world of things, and lives, and minds; the psychology that finds in the soul something similar to, or even identical with, divine Reality. . . .' The book is an anthology of mystical writings taken from Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Persian, Chinese, indeed, every conceivable writer on spiritual experience—though curiously Dante is left out. The Bible is not quoted because its great words are so overlaid with traditional usage as to have lost for the time being their resonance. Eckhart and St. John of the Cross are called upon freely, though a fair balance is kept between Western and Oriental writers. As an assembly of relevant passages the book is a skilful performance. But the passages are not picked as one picks ripe fruit but have all been assimilated, and so made peculiarly the writer's own. One might say that here we have the author's Commonplace book of mystical excerpts, arranged under suitable headings in sequence, with his interpretations, reflections, and judgements—with sometimes pungent remarks directed to an ungodly generation.

Where will Aldous Huxley come to rest? Who knows the things of a man save the spirit that is in him? But so far as Christian mysticism is concerned it is evident that Huxley's sympathies are with Pseudo-Dionysius and that he would fain follow the Via Negativa, which, says Dr. Inge, has led Christian devotion into the dark. In *Grey Eminence* he attacks Father Benet's departure from the Dionysian tradition and castigates 'Jesus-centrism' as an 'aberrant mystical doctrine'. At the moment Huxley is not becoming Christian as we understand Christianity with its teaching that 'no man cometh unto the Father but by me', and has accepted for himself, and is teaching his disciples a spirituality best described as Neo Buddhism. Baron Von Hügel who acted as spiritual director to Evelyn Underhill at a time when she was already recognized as an exponent of Mysticism, gently took her to task for having a religion that was no better than Unitarianism. Evelyn Underhill confessed that she had no experience of Jesus as a Person and Redeemer. Von Hügel's word was timely and had its effect as subsequent books and teaching of this gifted woman plainly show. The criticism that might with justice have been levied against her at the time, of having a philosophy of mysticism rather than an experience of the living Christ may be justly levied against Aldous Huxley. Anyhow, people inclined to mysticism need to be advised where they may easily be led astray.

There is another respect in which the teaching of this writer is weak and that is in not laying sufficient stress on the work of God and consequent over-emphasis on the part played by man in self-discipline and self-orientation. The Christian religion, whether for saints, mystics, seers, or plain ordinary folk, is a religion of Grace—Grace abounding. There is included in *The Perennial Philosophy* a short chapter on Grace and Free Will and the quotations and definitions are admirable, so far as they go; but one cannot escape the feeling that this chapter, and the book, are written by one who places first and foremost his own aspirations, will, and endeavour, to find the Ground of all being. There is throughout, one feels, a kind of strenuous over-anxiety, as of one not content to place the wood upon the altar and wait for the celestial fire to descend. In a word, 'means' loom larger than 'ends'.

But here, say what one will, is a book about spiritual things. It is a book written

from the interior life seeking reality. Here is a man who knows that the soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul. Here is one who has at least gone some way toward having nothing and having all things; so that in light of this noblest aspiration it is lacking in grace for Joad to write of Huxley as having gone sour. Whatever the book may provoke us to think and feel, it is to be hoped that those who claim to exercise the Cure of Souls will turn their attention to the subject matter of *The Perennial Philosophy*, whether they choose to read the book or not. I am glad to have it for all the precious things it contains and as a record of what another pilgrim soul on that lonely path of the mystic way has discovered for himself.

This work, let us not forget, comes from a man of letters. Is it not rather strange that there seems to be more sensibility among artists and writers to spiritual influences and trends than among theologians and pastors of the flock? In 1933 Charles Morgan published *The Fountain*, in which the question was posed—Where shall man find Invulnerability? It might have carried the sub-title, 'A study of Contemplation', for that highest spiritual degree was certainly in the mind of the writer at the time. H. G. Wells felt the moving of the spirit and had a short religious period when he wrote *The Undying Fire*. Middleton Murry has written in his later period almost entirely on the things of the spirit and confesses a devotion to Jesus such as is seldom heard expressed in such authentic words. Most noticeable in the integrity of his mind and his patient waiting upon the spirit is T. S. Eliot. One may not know what *The Four Quartettes* is about, that is to say, one may not comprehend its depth, but one has only to take up the poems and read what one can understand and he then knows that here is one on the right track for Perennial Philosophy or whatever name one prefers to give to Ultimate things. But why, oh! why this dearth of thinkers and teachers in devotional theology? Why should the children of the Wesleys, who gave us the most profound teaching in experimental religion, be left to guides who, whilst offering to lead, are heard to be 'inquiring the way'?

J. HENRY BODGENER

METHODISM IN HIROSHIMA

THERE ARE not very many Methodist congregations in Japan and it seems ironical that Hiroshima, which contains one of them, should have been chosen as the target for the first Atom-Bomb attack in August 1945. Many accounts have appeared in the British Press of the utter devastation caused by this attack, but it is quite impossible to describe the extent and intensity of the destruction. Whilst serving in Japan I paid several visits to this stricken city, and on each occasion my heart was heavy with a realization of the resultant human misery and suffering. Primitive huts of wood and corrugated-iron are springing up amongst the ruins, and streets are busy again, but thousands of gravestones rising out of the rubble serve as a constant reminder of the scope of the calamity.

The Methodist minister of Hiroshima, the Rev. Kiyoshi Tanimoto, visited me shortly after my arrival in his country and told me his story. This story is contained in graphic detail in John Hersey's book *Hiroshima*, which has been published in the Penguin Series. I learned that before the raid there were fifteen churches in the city, now only three congregations are meeting; viz.: Methodist, Baptist, and Roman Catholic. The Methodist church was founded sixty years ago by the Episcopal Methodist Church of America, and at the beginning of August 1945 the church had a membership of eight hundred folk. Of these 158 were killed outright, and many

more were injured, so that a mere fraction of the original congregation remains. The church itself was a fine modern cruciform building in white stone. This was destroyed as was also the Sunday school, which was built in the same compound.

The congregation meets in groups of thirty each Sunday in Mr. Tanimoto's temporary shack in the Ushita suburb. It was a strange and thrilling experience to share in a service there as I did on a number of occasions. The room was very tiny, and packed almost to suffocation by a motley crowd of all ages. Some would be wearing European clothes and others would provide a splash of vivid colour with the traditional 'kimono'. In the usual absence of chairs the people sat cross-legged on the floor. One corner contained a small table on which stood a simple wooden Cross, and another an American organ which had seen much better days! The windows had been liberally patched with rice-paper, and the sky was clearly visible through gaps in the ceiling!

The service was conducted in Japanese and my address was interpreted sentence by sentence. On my first visit I began by offering them the greetings and good wishes of the Methodist Church of Great Britain, and followed on by outlining the differences which existed between us—differences of language, environment, tradition, and culture. I then proceeded to point out the unifying power of our common Christian possessions. We had a common need of the forgiveness of God, a common experience of the saving power of Christ, and a common hope in the realization of the Kingdom of God—as the only feasible solution of national and international problems. The welcome and friendliness which was invariably shown to me on these occasions was a remarkable proof of the validity of Christian fellowship. In spite of the barriers of language, and opposed national ideologies, we were 'one in Christ Jesus'.

No account of Hiroshima Methodism would be complete without a reference to the Jogakuin Methodist Girls' High School, where education is given on a specifically Christian basis. The Principal (the Rev. Dr. T. Matsumoto) and the Dean (the Rev. Dr. S. Matsushita) are both graduates of American Universities, and two-thirds of the staff are Christian. Their modern European-style buildings which were in the centre of the city were bombed out of existence, and over three hundred casualties were sustained by the pupils. Showing genuine initiative the President and the Dean obtained sufficient timber to build eight large sheds, about four miles from the original site, in which the school is now housed. It was my privilege in May 1946 to reopen this school. It was an inspiring sight to see nine hundred girls crowded together in one of these primitive sheds; so much alike with their pale yellowish faces, their straight, black hair, and their navy-blue school uniform. The ceremony began with a hymn—'Jesu, Lover of my soul'—in Japanese. I was grateful to the person who told me what it was as I should never have guessed otherwise! During the singing of this hymn I took stock of my audience and I could not help but notice that here a leg was missing, there an arm, this girl had an eye-shade, and that one carried the scar of a frightful burn—silent witnesses to the horror of that unforgettable day.

The Principal then addressed the school on plans for the future, and introduced me. After this I spoke briefly on the amazing possibilities of Christian education, and the ceremony closed with prayers and the singing of the school song. I was so impressed by this song that I asked for a translation. I am going to quote this because it illustrates better than anything I can say the spirit of the school.

*Iris flower, emblem of ours, sweet and gentle,
Blooming forth by the gracious touch of God,
And flourishing in this city of waters,
Oh! how many long years it has kept growing!
Oh! glorious is Jogakuin, our Alma Mater!*

METHODISM IN HIROSHIMA

*With reverence to the gracious behests on high,
In answer to the august call from above,
Will we strive to attain virtues,
As fit generations of this land.
Oh! glorious is Jogakuin, our Alma Mater!*

*Training ourselves morning and night,
Working together with God our Father,
Faces turned ever to the future, bright with hope,
Let us keep on gladly rendering services of love.
Oh! glorious is Jogakuin, our Alma Mater!*

It must not be assumed from all this that Hiroshima is a Christian city; very far from it! All that I have attempted to do is to depict the existence of a small nucleus of Christian folk worshipping and witnessing under extremely difficult circumstances. There is in this congregation a virile missionary spirit and real optimism for the future. Plans are going ahead for the evangelization of the area and also for the reconstruction of their premises. So out of the wilderness of destruction, out of the hell of unutterable agony, the Church of Christ rises again as it has done throughout history in all quarters of the globe; a part of the indestructible fellowship, a province of the eternal kingdom of God!

LESLIE R. EARNSHAW

 THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE

CHURCHMEN and non-Churchmen are betraying a great deal of anxious interest in the future of organized Christianity. Broadly speaking, the discussions start from two opposing view-points. On the one hand is the view that the Church¹ as we have known it in the past will continue; thus, for example, episcopacy is regarded as an essential and permanent element in the Church. This view is doubtless the result of a belief that the Church is not only the Divine Society but the Divine Institution—a strong belief obviously, but as obviously a dangerous belief. On the other hand is the view (not by any means confined to the non-Churchman) that the survival of the historic Church and the survival of the Christian Faith are not necessarily the same, and that the Church must undergo something like a revolution if it is to survive at all.

There is, however, another point of view from which this inquiry may begin, namely, that the Church of the future, like a living organism in its environment, will be acted upon by irresistible forces, both human and divine, that must shape its organization so that it can fulfil its mission to mankind. This sort of compulsion, external and internal to the Church, is no new thing in its history; though perhaps it has not been readily recognized. Notable instances are the abandonment by the Apostolic Church of the belief in the immediate reappearance of Christ and the consequent reorientation of emphasis in Christian teaching; the relinquishing of the Church's claim to govern the whole area of intellectual interest in the face of the demands of humanistic culture; and, in our own times, the retreat of the Church in the field of cosmology before the advance of scientific fact. Pressure of this kind is now being brought to bear on the Church, and, in the new world that is dawning, is likely to increase more and more.

¹ 'Church' in this article means the Institution regarded as a whole; 'Churches', the Institution in its various denominational forms.

Taking for granted that the Church is the depositary of the Truth of God; that its mission is to minister Christ, the Bread of Life, and the Light of the World, to mankind; that it is the Mediator of the Gospel of Salvation; consider some of the forces that are already at work upon the Church and that can be anticipated in the more or less remote future.

(1) It is becoming plain that the vexed and urgent question of Christian Unity can find no solution by way of accommodation and compromise, but only by the sacrifice of those sacerdotal and theological bases on which denominationalism rests. In a world that is moving, and must move, out toward economic, political, and even cultural unity, the Church will be compelled, therefore, if it is to realize its dream of One-ness, to a federation of free, liberal, democratic, evangelical Christian Societies, emphasizing, not the sacerdotal and theological, but the practical ethics of the Christian faith and the spiritual community of believers.

(2) The Church has lost contact with the large mass of the people: something like a crisis is developing, and much of the organized work of the Church may well disappear as simply redundant. It would not be safe to assume that this is either a local or a temporary phenomenon; nor to suppose that the situation will be remedied by a revival of religion. Side by side with this must be placed the fact of a popular and intense interest in religion, so that large numbers claim to be Christian who repudiate any pretence or intent to be Churchmen. Here is a paradoxical situation that must sooner or later compel the Church to offer the hungry multitude the Bread of Life by a drastic adaptation of itself to the needs of men.

(3) A third pressure working upon the Church is the fact that the doctrines, dogmas, sacraments, orders, by which the Church represents itself to the world are questioned as to their authoritative significance for religion. Valid enough for the pious, will not the Church be forced to proclaim and manifest its Gospel in ways plain, understandable, and acceptable to the common judgement?

(4) Mankind is on the doorstep of vast and far-reaching changes. A recent speaker on the wireless said indeed that the changes that are likely to take place are of the kind that happen but once in ten thousand years. The application of atomic energy merely emphasizes this fact. A new civilization is on the rise. Transport, internationalism, machinery, communism in one form or another, education, printing, science; these forces will shape the pattern of the new world: the lines of human evolution for centuries ahead are set. It is clear that a Church with its roots in medievalism cannot for long command a hearing in this new world.

(5) One other compulsion must be named, remote as it is. Cultural education will increase and more and more affect the thinking and sentiments of the masses. The tendency will, therefore, be toward secularism and rationalism—not necessarily antagonistic to religion, but critical and scientific. The Church will be forced therefore in the end to make clear what the 'Truth' is of which it claims to be the depositary, and to discover to the people what is the Gospel of God for mankind, with which Gospel is bound up the survival and advancement of the race, because it is the Gospel of God. It will be compelled to find a new polemic of the Faith.

These, then, are some of the compulsion forces that must play upon the Church of the future, making inevitably necessary various adaptations of the Church to the world to which it ministers. The adaptations will be probably unconscious or spontaneous, rather than planned or purposeful—like those of the living organism to its environment, as suggested above. They will not arise from a vain desire of the Church to stand well in the eye of the world, nor from a facile willingness to yield to the world in order to win its patronage: they will represent its purification, growth, and enlightenment.

What form the Institution will assume in days to come it is idle to speculate, though it may be possible at hazard to assess the changes that are likely to ensue.

(1) The Church will tend to delimit and narrow the area in which it claims authority, and this particularly on the intellectual side of religion. This is a larger question than can here be dealt with, but in general it may be put: That the Church cannot claim to have received a Divine revelation, either in the Bible or in the Church, of that which belongs to transcendental mystery; and that that only is authoritatively and finally true which is capable of rational and/or experiential justification. This will mean that in some degree theology gives up its historic claim to deal with 'truth' that is beyond reason and experience; that much that is now included in this claim is admitted to belong to the sphere of metaphysics; and that these matters, while the subject of theological inquiry and formulation, are not regarded as within the necessity of Christian conformity. In other words, the Church's theology in the future is bound to become more liberal and less dogmatic. The theologian and the philosopher will, as it were, be left with his bone; and his task will be, not to defend what the Church believes, so much as to examine and discuss, as the intellectual must, what may arise as a consequence of the faith. This, while not decrying intellectualism, will be an immense gain to the Church. It will redirect the thought and spiritual energy of the Church to the Christ who is its focal centre: it will restore 'faith' to its proper and redeeming significance, that is, a trust and submission, an obedience and devotion to Jesus as the Lord and Saviour, as is manifest in the New Testament: it will release the Church from the vain task of trying to explain the inexplicable (like the omnipotence of God) and to describe the indescribable (like the inner nature of Deity): it will dethrone the Bible as the 'paper Pope' and enable it to be read untrammelled by Jewish theories of inspiration and Rabbinic habits of allegorizing: it will tend to supplant Creeds, formulated in the language of obsolete philosophical categories, as the confession of the faith, by a simple, practical affirmation of a personal and corporate submission to Christ, such as all Christians who bear the marks of Jesus have ever confessed; it will, in short, make the Church again a clear and potent witness to the faith that saves men and women from sin, fear, and death.

To pursue this point a little farther: the Church is increasingly aware that its traditional apologia is confusing rather than enlightening. The godlessness and irreligion of our generation is not due as much as we suppose to wickedness, but to bewilderment. How curious and infinitely regrettable it is that in our age multitudes of people have recited at the call of the Church the Nicene Creed, much of which is not understandable to the average person, while their own agony has cried out for some rational doctrine of the Providence of God in the cruel world God has caused us to enter! But the Church has no such doctrine of Providence, nor yet of Prayer, nor of the Word of God, nor yet of Christian morality: it is left to any Christian teacher to say what he thinks, or can find out, or has experienced of these things which have to do with the very core of true religion! And what a torrent of nonsense must thus have been poured out. The Church will be compelled to adjust and elucidate its message, its authoritative message, to the needs of life, placing the emphasis where life demands it be placed, on the practical, the rational, the experiential in religion. In doing so, it will leave the philosophers and theologians to their happy quest, and itself rediscover the method and the manner of its Lord and of His earliest Church of the New Testament. Then will no longer be heard the jibe of the secularist that the God of the Christian scholar is not the God of the Christian worshipper in the pew—a jibe that every educated Christian knows to be true!

(2) Again, the Church will be compelled to attempt more seriously the actual realization of the Christian Community, not so much in the world at large, as within

the limits of its own fellowship. It must revert at last to the New Testament model, that of a community believing in Jesus as Lord and Saviour, bound together by His Spirit in a spiritual fellowship, and walking in the light of His word; a brotherhood in which love determines, directs, controls its corporate life. It must become not only a microcosm of the Kingdom, but an exhibition to the world of the Kingdom, an actualization in an evil world of the rule of Christ among men. Its historic 'marks' of Unity, Apostolicity, Holiness, Catholicity will come to be recognized in the fruits by which Christ's people are known to the world, and not by credal and liturgical kinship. The world is now passionately seeking, and will seek more passionately, some basis of unity in diversity: internationalism is becoming a paramount necessity in the whole world: mankind cannot go on much longer existing in separate national, economic, political compartments: men and women of understanding recognize that the basis of any sort of effective internationale is to be found in religion and the morality springing therefrom. If then, the Christian religion is the highest known to mankind, as the Church affirms, it must become inevitable that the Church must achieve and manifest the Christian community. (Ultimately, perhaps, the world-race is between an economic and a religious communism: if the race is won by the former (as sometimes seems likely) it must at last come round in full circle to the latter, since man does not live by bread alone.)

Here once more can be visualized the emergence of free Christian societies, liberal in theology, anchored in one creed, and that the earliest in Christendom: Jesus is Lord.

Preoccupied with the task of realizing the Rule of Christ within its own borders, the Church will not be a closed, unworldly society. On the contrary, its witness will be in the highest degree evangelical, and its example all-persuasive. It will, and not in word only, constantly exemplify and announce the human and spiritual values that are implicit in Christianity and on which all personal and communal life must at length be based, while the vitality of its own religious life will discard forms of worship and tests of orthodoxy as in any sense determinants of a true faith.

(3) Further, to bring its Gospel to bear upon the life of men and women, the Church will be compelled by the growing demand that life should be happy to emphasize Christ's way to the life of blessedness, peace, triumph. It will not, and cannot, yield anything of its ethical demand on human nature, or its ideal of personal holiness and the disciplines necessary to that attainment under grace, nor its pursuit of social righteousness. Nevertheless, it must make effective its claim that all life is sacred, and elucidate what manner of life that is and how it may be accomplished by the average man in normal conditions. The saints and the mystics will not be held up as types of Christian piety, removed, as they are, from the common ways of life; the double standard of obedience, one for the priest and another for the plumber, will be abandoned, and likewise artificial distinctions such as 'venial transgressions' and 'works of supererogation'; 'original sin' will be left as a subject for theological debate, while the Church strives to integrate the life of the developing child into the Redeemed Community. Christ's way, in its completeness, as the only way to happiness must more and more dominate the Church's teaching to the people: man's right to happiness must be more completely acknowledged.

One urgent question in this connexion already cries out for Christian solution—that is the question of Sex. What havoc has been wrought by the Church's dictum that 'concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin' in face of the simple fact that without it no child could be born into the world! What human wreckage in one form or another comes to the psycho-therapist's hand as a direct result of this denial of a purely natural and inevitable energy! How negative, equivocal, sometimes misleading (as that sex is a thing to be 'mastered' and not rather to be

used as a means to happiness) has the Church's pronouncements been on this vexed subject! And how much blame must be laid at the door of the Church that sex has become a furtive, secret, shame-faced, nasty thing in the common mind; with those secondary results of this attitude, such as the 'sex-madness' of our age manifest in its books, pictures, films, plays, dress, and even in advertisements! The Church will more and more be compelled to teach men and women, especially youth, that chastity is a needful discipline *unto married happiness*; that sex within marriage is blessed of God to the enrichment of married joy and the achievement of marital felicity; that sexual fidelity is essential to personal, domestic, social well-being and not merely a personal virtue, duty, self-denial—that, in short, Christian self-denial and discipline are *means to the attainment of the enjoyment of life*. Here is a tremendous task for the Church which cannot much longer be neglected; the Church might well begin the task by a full and frank admission that sex is an *instinct* of the human nature created by God, and not a residuum of the prehistoric beast.

(4) Lastly, the Church will be compelled as time passes to shed the superstitions of various kinds that have gathered about its teaching and its worship. The spread of education and the scientific attitude to life, already so marked in our time, will be the compelling factors in this direction; even though there may be a temporary reaction toward exaggerated symbolism. It goes without saying that the cruder superstitions and credulities must pass away, such as those associated with infant baptism and with burial. Religious notions like those about heaven and hell, that God can do anything, that by faith impossibilities can be wrought, that God always answers prayer, that Providence grants immunity from calamity, that God wills everything that happens—these must give way before a Christian rationalism that insists on truth and experience.

Likewise the Church must modify its claim to be the vehicle of divine grace and the instrument of the Holy Spirit—claims that its history does not confirm. It must at last have courage to admit that the theory of Apostolical Succession is an historical fiction, and that the only authority it possesses is that of evident truth, verified in life and Christian experience. (An instance of the sort of irrationality that must at length be abandoned occurs in C. S. Lewis's *Problem of Pain*, where in discussing a certain interpretation of the Garden of Eden story he says: 'But I assume that the Holy Spirit would not have allowed the latter to grow up in the Church and win the assent of great doctors unless it also was true and useful as far as it went.') In the same direction, the Church must come to offer the Scriptures to the world as containing that kind of truth that believing men cannot gainsay and can validate in life. The theory of prophecy as foretelling the unknown future must be repudiated as inadmissible to thoughtful men. The Bible will come to be used by the Church with more circumspection and integrity.

But most inevitable, and perhaps most remote also, in this field of change will be the compelled abandonment of many pretensions of the Priesthood, and this in its turn must affect the worship and ritual of the Church. The ideas of Priesthood have their roots in paganism and primitivism. That a human being can be set apart for sacred duties is commonplace; but the idea that through such men other men have access to God and receive His grace cannot persist in the Church for ever. The cry has already been raised: 'The Church does not exist for the benefit of the clergy.' Education and the leisure to explore the field of religion must produce in due time laymen and laywomen fitted intellectually and spiritually for any task in the Christian society that is profitable. Such a notion that a Sacrament is invalid unless performed by an ordained male will become stupid to intelligent men and women. The preaching and pastoral offices of the Church must come more and more to the laity, and the matter of preaching less and less confined to doctrinal

provis
hood
point,
must
organ
Th
and i
the re
it see
name
must
be p
askin
plete
less
emph
A
up i
indif
assur
in th
life t
crisi

Stud
To
some
in c
is m
reco
cent
Boo
assig
sugg
othe
itself
Can
prel
Old
of I
Just
law
a d
by
con
tion

provisos and credal limitations. Whether in the course of time a professional priesthood may disappear as the Christian brotherhood is more closely realized is a moot point, but it is certain that the pretensions that now surround the priestly office must cease to be. And this in turn will affect fundamentally and drastically the organized life of the Church.

Thus the new world that is dawning will compel great transformation in the Church and in the Churches. It may be that the greatest of all will be the breaking out of the real life of the Church from the theological and ecclesiastical wrappings in which it seems at present buried. In any case, what has always been true of the Church, namely that when it is closest to Christ in devotion it is at its best and strongest, must come to the front of its thought, interest, prayer, worship, and service. It will be prepared to sacrifice theological consistency and ritual exclusiveness for that, asking men and women for the faith in Christ as Lord and Saviour which is complete, one might say, blind, submission to Him. Its intellectual life will be no whit less vigorous, but it will lose its interest in heresy as hitherto understood and emphasize that by which men lay hold on Christ and make Him their own.

A Church thus exemplifying its faith to the world and in process of being built up into a temple of God will have authority in a world which could not remain indifferent to its spiritual experience and visible achievement. The Church may assume its proper place of leadership, and promote out of its own life that revival in the hearts of men that alone can make the problems and complexities of human life tractable and soluble. This is an age of crisis for mankind: it is also an age of crisis for the Church of Christ—for ALL the Churches of Christ.

W. H. BAKER

Recent Literature

Studies in Biblical Law, by David Daube. (Cambridge Press, 21s.)

To the student of the Old Testament, law is generally understood to stand in some kind of opposition to prophecy, as the service of God in *cultus* rather than in conduct or personal homage; and although recent writers have urged that there is more of the 'cultic' in the institution of Hebrew prophecy than has often been recognized, there can be no doubt that the great prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries attached little importance to the ceremonies of the altar. But both the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy make it clear that much importance is assigned in the books of the law themselves to conduct; and a little reflection will suggest that unless Hebrew society functioned in quite a different way from any others, there must have been a body of criminal and civil law, developing as society itself grew more complex. It is the merit of Dr. Daube, a fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, to have shown how many traces of this legal *corpus*, both in its comprehensiveness and its development, are to be found in the historical books of the Old Testament. He is the more fitted for his task by his knowledge of the vast body of Rabbinic writings and of the *corpus* of Roman Law, from the Twelve Tables to Justinian; he illustrates his points with equal felicity from Sumerian and Babylonian law and from Greek and Latin classics; indeed, a sixth of the whole book is given to a discussion of certain passages in Gaius, which is attached to the main argument by the thinnest of threads. Yet the author knows what he is doing, since his chief contention is that both the dominant ideas of Hebrew law and their gradual alteration, have their parallels in Roman law, advancing, as Maine long ago laid down,

from status to contract, and from legal fact to fiction. For example, the procedure of Joseph's brothers in exhibiting his blood-stained coat to Jacob, the gift or the loan of Reuben's mandrakes, the view over the Promised Land which was allowed to Moses, the four-fold deception in the story of Jacob (Esau, Isaac, Rachel, and the 'teraphim'), and the modification of the *lex talionis*, are all shown to be illuminated by the recognized legal practice and maxims of other societies. While Dr. Daube is careful to point out that his contentions need disturb neither the fundamentalist nor the critic, he shows that the narratives must at least be taken seriously as evidence for ancient Hebrew beliefs and practices which lie beneath them. He has ably opened up a path of investigation which deserves to be energetically followed.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

The Prophetic Word, by W. E. Booth Taylor. (Carey Press, 7s. 6d.)

This work is intended to be an elementary introduction to the prophetic literature of the Old Testament for the use of Sunday school teachers and others engaged in elementary religious instruction. Its aim is to interpret the teaching of the prophets in the light of their own times, and to show its connexion with New Testament teaching and its abiding worth. The period covered is that from Amos to John the Baptist; and *Job*, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, and *Daniel*, as well as most of the works in the prophetic corpus, are included. While the book is written with fervour, it may be wondered whether a book intended for beginners does not sacrifice some of its possible helpfulness by giving no account either of the prophets who preceded the canonical prophets (apart from a casual reference to Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha) or of the false prophets. Again, if the beginner is to be encouraged to read the prophetic books for himself, he ought to be told something about their literary character and about the meaning of some of the most important words which occur in them. But this is not done for him here. The book is overburdened with quotations (often lengthy) from the standard one-volume commentaries, from Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and from sundry other works. These quotations, again, are not invariably felicitous (for instance, is the citation from W. L. Wardle on pp. 93 f. really enlightening to the beginner when severed from its original context?). In addition to one or two obvious misprints there are some erroneous or incautious statements: e.g. Isaiah 25^o is adduced as evidence for the teaching of Isaiah of Jerusalem; the book of *Job* is called an epic, and its theme is said to have been 'first outlined' during the Exile or soon afterwards; and the hoary heresy that the prophets were 'forthtellers rather than foretellers' is repeated without the substantial qualifications which are clearly necessary. These defects mar what might have been a helpful introduction.

G. W. ANDERSON

New Testament Prophecy, by Harold A. Guy. (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

This careful and detailed study of Prophetism makes a valuable contribution to Biblical scholarship. By 'prophetism' Mr. Guy means 'the movement or the phenomena with which prophets are associated', as distinct from 'prophecy', which denotes the content of the prophet's message. Naturally, the investigation begins with a discussion of the evolution of the Hebrew prophet and the distinction between 'the Seers', the bands of *nebi'im*, and the series of great prophets that began with Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. The characteristic feature of the divine 'possession' of the latter is described as 'a moral and spiritual exaltation and an ability to convey to others the revelation-message thus received'. An interesting treatment follows of the psychology of the prophet. Mr. Guy argues that the prophet's exaltation of spirit did not suppress the activity of his mind, but heightened it. Mr. Guy next

investigates the personality and ministry of John the Baptist and the prophetic consciousness of Jesus Himself. All the characteristics of the prophet, he maintains, are found in Jesus—in the form and content of His teaching, His insight into character, and His grasp of the contemporary political, social, and international situation. Greatly daring, but with a full recognition of the precariousness of the undertaking, Mr. Guy faces the question of the consciousness of Jesus and His interpretation of His prophetic mission. In this connexion, he explains the use of the titles 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God' from a new angle and with illuminating results. He claims that the references to the Son of Man in the Gospels are better explained if the basic thought of Jesus was dependent on the use of the term in Ezekiel and if He combined therewith the conception of the Suffering Servant in Second Isaiah. 'In this case, Jesus thought of His identification with the Son of Man not apocalyptically but prophetically.' More speculative is Mr. Guy's treatment of the great saying, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father . . .'. The tentative suggestion that in the original Aramaic Jesus may have said: 'No one knows God except his Servant', does not seem necessary, and it reveals the limitations of this particular approach. Mr. Guy not only sees Jesus as 'the climax and consummation of the spirit of the greatest of the Old Testament prophets', but follows Otto in describing His consciousness as 'charismatic' and endorses his judgement: 'Such a one is more than Prophet. He is the Son.' I have left myself no space to trace Mr. Guy's fascinating discussions of such themes as the prophetism of the primitive Church, and the parallel movements in contemporary religions in Judaism, in Roman and Greek religion, and in the Mystery Religions; but these mere titles show that his treatment is broadly based. The writer hails from Richmond. His book is a first-class study of a fruitful (if limited) field, which yields a harvest like the field in the parable, thirtyfold, sixtyfold, a hundredfold.

VINCENT TAYLOR

Paul's Epistle to the Romans, by E. F. Scott. (S.C.M., 6s.)

The Epistle to the Romans has been the subject of so many large volumes that the student may wonder what is the value of a book of little more than a hundred pages until he sees that this book is by E. F. Scott. He will then expect more value in the hundred pages than in many larger books, and he will not be disappointed. In an introduction Dr. Scott gives a clear account of the origin and purpose of this epistle. He accepts the view that the original letter consisted of fifteen chapters, and that Chapter 16 was another letter, probably written to Ephesus, and appended to *Romans*. The case for this he states at the end of the commentary. The commentary itself treats of chapters or sections as a whole, and, since it is written by one who is a great master in the art of exposition, it is admirably designed to enable an intelligent reader to follow the thread of Paul's argument—to see clearly, if one may put it so, what he is driving at. After the commentary there follows a chapter on 'The Central Teaching of the Epistle', in which the main issues are reviewed in a comprehensive way and distinguished from those which are secondary. The last chapter on 'The Value of the Epistle Today' is not the least important part of the book. The whole is marked by that mature scholarship and that gift of lucid interpretation which are characteristic of all Dr. Scott's work. This book will prove most helpful both to the general reader, who is so apt to lose his way in this epistle, and also to the student, who may miss the wood in the trees when he reads some of the larger commentaries. The preacher too will learn afresh how modern this epistle is in some aspects, and how he may interpret its message to the needs of the present day.

F. B. CLOGG

The Gospel according to Gamaliel, by Gerald Heard. (Cassell, 7s. 6d.)

Readers of *The Code of Christ* will know that Mr. Gerald Heard holds that all the higher religions of the world proclaim substantially the same truth. He describes himself in the introduction to this book as having been 'brought up as a Christian', and tells us that, in writing it, he is 'attempting to view through the eyes of a Hebrew that channel through which the Eternal Gospel has come to Western man.' Many of us who do not share his opinions will agree that 'a mutual understanding' between Jew and Gentile is greatly to be desired. Mr. Heard is evidently not deeply read in Rabbinics, but that was scarcely to be expected. Mis-spellings of Jewish words are frequent, e.g. 'Bar-Enas' (for 'Son of Man'), 'Zaccharius', Nazarite (for Nazirite). Again, would Gamaliel have spoken of a 'Sacerdotum' (sic) when referring to the temple-priesthood? 'Ben Sirach', for whom several times Gamaliel is made to express reverence, was not acceptable to the Pharisees, because he denied that there was any 'inquisition of life in the grave'; his book rather represents tendencies which, at the beginning of the Christian era, were characteristic of the Sadducean party, and is a welcome reminder that, like the Pharisees, the Sadducees, were not always as black as they are sometimes painted. Hillel, Gamaliel's grandfather, is idealized; and it is an exaggeration to say that three-quarters of our Lord's ethical sayings can be found in his sayings. Mr. Heard, in his portrait of Jesus as seen through the eyes of a sympathetic Pharisee, does succeed in giving the impression of a union of unearthly power with grace, gentleness, and an uncanny insight in dealings with men and women, but he is attempting the impossible when he tries to paraphrase and expand the words of Jesus. 'Never man spake like this man' would not be true of his Jesus. A painful example can be found in Mr. Heard's glosses on the saying 'Render to Caesar, etc.'. Jesus is made to say: 'Return to Caesar what he provides for you to use. Pay for the valuable services he yields you, but don't think that you can trick me by confusing the issue. Don't try to disguise the fact that your sharp exchange practices are robbing God and His people. Instead of trying to put us off the scent, see that you render Him His due. I warn you, don't try to cover your pious frauds by putting us off the scent with the Roman as to where the true issue lies.' We feel that Mr. Heard is in difficulties here, but that does not quite excuse him for attributing such elaborate and twisted moralizing to Jesus. With Paul he is even less successful. It is surely a travesty of Paul's Gospel to say: 'God will damn those who think, who dare think, that they can fulfil the law. . . . The Law can only be fulfilled by blood. Blood, yes, but invariably human blood for human sin!' We cannot recognize Paul in this hectoring fanatic, or Peter in the words: 'No! but sinners ever sinning and ever being forgiven. Absolution and grace over and over again.' The picture of the two great apostles racing to Rome to get their 'Gospel' in first, as given in the closing paragraphs of the book, is ludicrous. Yet here and there in this highly original but oddly perverse book the author strikes the authentic fire, and it should be read with sympathy and an open mind.

J. ALEXANDER FINDLAY

The Why and Wherefore of the Church, by Andrew Blair. (Dacre Press, 2s. 6d.)

The Church of God, by F. J. Taylor. (The Canterbury Press, 6s.)

The first of these books belongs to the series of 'The Mirfield Books' and deals with the Doctrine, Fellowship, and Worship of the Church. It lays special stress on the Sacraments (extending these to seven, the Twenty-fifth Article notwithstanding!), and knits together its whole argument around the idea of apostolic succession, as understood by Anglo-Catholics. Though skilfully written, the book will raise many

queries both within Anglicanism and outside it. For example: On what grounds can it be asserted that the nonconformist theory of the ministry regards the minister as essentially the delegate of the laity and responsible to the laity in the discharge of his office? Again: Does the first Rubric after the Rite of the Public Baptism of infants in the Prayer Book really state (or even imply) that Baptism as such confers the grace of salvation? The conception of the Church as the custodian of the evangel of Christ hardly appears in these pages.

The second book belongs to the series entitled 'St. Paul's Library', the purpose of which is to give 'a distinctively Anglican interpretation of evangelical theology', as a contribution to the cause of reunion. The book is marked throughout by clear historical knowledge, penetrating religious insight, and precision of statement. For example, in dealing with the 'Notes' of the Church, Mr. Taylor writes: 'We do not have to create unity but to remove the barriers to its expression'—'The Church of Christ, by reason of its holiness, is a sacerdotal society in which all its members have the right of approaching God at all times and in every place'; 'Catholicity depends, not on some formal principle like the Papacy, or the existence of an episcopal ministry, but upon the universality of Christ'; 'The whole Church is apostolic in the sense that it is a body, created and sent by God for the fulfilment of a mission in the world, . . . whose testimony to Jesus Christ is the same as that of the Apostles. This and this alone is the element of true continuity.' So the Church is 'the sphere of the sovereignty of Christ' in this world. This is a sound and satisfying book.

JOHN T. WILKINSON

Prophetic Prayer, A History of the Christian Doctrine of Prayer to the Reformation, by H. Trevor Hughes. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

The Vice-Principal of Westminster Training College tells us that his experience as a Chaplain to the Forces has only deepened his impression that most people inside and outside the Church think of prayer as something scarcely relevant to ordinary life. The main line of division that Mr. Hughes here traces through the Christian centuries is that between 'prophetic' and 'mystical' prayer—between the prayer that seeks communion with God concerning all the affairs of life and that in which the soul, by withdrawing from the external world, would lose itself in union with God—between prayer in which what Söderblom calls the 'Thou and I' relationship still persists and that in which the worshipper's personality is absorbed in the Divine being. Mr. Hughes shows that Christian prayer began as 'prophetic'. In the praying of Paul and of our Lord Himself the closest union with God leaves still the 'Thou' and the 'I' distinct. Then, in the Christian Platonists, began the mystical development that came to full expression in monastic religion, with its emphasis on union with God rather than communion. From this came emancipation in the teaching of Luther and Calvin, with their return to the prayer that is dynamic rather than static, a spirituality linked with the concerns of normal living, and a faith that 'finds the Master not only on the Mount of Transfiguration, but in the valley below'. It may be doubted whether so sharp a distinction can justly be drawn. The mysticism of the medieval Church felt itself deeply rooted in Pauline and Johannine teaching, nor, except in its most negative extremes, did it really imply the absorption of the human soul in the Divine being, any more than did Charles Wesley when he spoke of being 'plunged in the Godhead's deepest sea and lost in Thy immensity'. But any book is welcome that recalls the Church to the central realities of the inner life, and Mr. Hughes's book is a careful study, the fruit of considerable reading and fresh thinking. When the author's father, the beloved first Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, read it shortly before his death, it must have rejoiced his heart.

FRANCIS B. JAMES

The Oracles of God, by T. H. L. Parker. (Lutterworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

We think of Calvin as a great theologian, a great ecclesiastical statesman, a great reformer of Church life and of morals; we do not always remember that he was a great preacher. Yet preaching was the chief means by which he did his mighty work in Geneva, and preaching was to him the chief function of the Pastor, who held the highest office in the Church. Mr. Parker has therefore done us a great service by writing this 'Introduction to the Preaching of John Calvin'. He first sketches the history of preaching before Calvin, and then Calvin's own career as a preacher; he gives a summary of Calvin's theology which is reliable on the whole, though it suffers from excessive brevity when he comes to Calvin's doctrine of the Church; he shows Calvin's vast influence on English preaching at certain very important periods; and he makes a real contribution to pure scholarship in his catalogue of Calvin's sermons. But the heart of his book lies in his chapters on Calvin's doctrine and method of preaching, and in his summons to the preachers of today to recover the vital elements of that expository preaching which was to Calvin the only kind of preaching that mattered. He brings out very clearly Calvin's view that the sermon, properly understood, is the Word of God speaking through man, confirmed in the heart of the hearer by the testimony of the Holy Spirit. The preacher is concerned, not to utter his own opinions, or to persuade his hearers that what he says is reasonable, but to proclaim the teaching of Holy Scripture. Thus his authority is absolute, divine. Can we return to this kind of preaching? Certainly we need to provide exposition, and more exposition, of the Bible—but can we, while we proclaim the Good News of God, repudiate all appeal to reason and claim to be above criticism? Mr. Parker drives us to extremes; but he faces us with very searching questions.

R. E. DAVIES

What Baptists Stand For, by Henry Cook. (Kingsgate Press, 6s.)

The Gathered Community, by Robert C. Walton. (Carey Press, 7s. 6d.)

These two books are indications of a certain restlessness among the Baptist Churches. The first is a pathetic reminder of how badly we are supplied with books on essential Baptist principles. It is a little book of less than two hundred pages, and it deals with no great controversy in any adequate way, yet it can be advertised as the 'latest and fullest discussion of the Baptist position'. Its general plan will meet with more approval than the distribution of the space among the various subjects. There are sometimes involved passages with an inadequate handling of 'Other Views'. But, on the whole, the book gives an accurate account of Baptist doctrines. In a rather difficult section attempts are made to reconcile the intense Independency of our Baptist Churches with a vague, but apparently equally powerful, world view, for the early Baptists 'regarded the local churches as livingly related for the common ends of the Gospel'. The short section on 'The Church's Sacraments' echoes Dr. Robinson's plea that Baptists should take up the word 'Sacrament' without fear and regain for it something of its earlier meaning. The section on 'the priesthood of all believers' is not easy reading, but it will repay careful study. The last chapter belongs to another book, and its space might well have been given to a fuller discussion of the Lord's Supper. Two appendixes reprint the reply of the Baptist Churches to the Lambeth appeal of 1920, and a resolution on Religious Liberty adopted at the Baptist World Congress in 1939.

The Gathered Community is not the work of one mind, but the result of group discussion. There is a great deal of clear thinking behind it, and the plan of the book is attractive. It falls naturally into three parts. In the first an attempt is made to define the Church of the New Testament, as conditioned by its Jewish heritage, its

expectation of *parousia*, and the ever-present driving power of the Holy Spirit. This section is refreshing and at times original. While we may not always agree with their conclusions, this group of younger Baptists have given careful consideration to various views, though the teaching of Dom Gregory Dix does not seem to have been considered. The second part describes the early Baptists and their attempt to reinterpret the New Testament for the seventeenth century. The deliberate omission of the medieval period puts the first and seventeenth centuries side by side in a very helpful way; but it might have been made even clearer that ultimate authority lies with the New Testament and not with Thomas Helwys. The third part, dealing with the Community of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, will be widely discussed by younger men. It does not go back to Calvin or any other master, but attempts (though not with complete success) to use the experience of the Baptist Fathers in interpreting the New Testament for today. Among much that is useful for discussion, one may mention the minister's own membership in his church. Every Baptist minister will recognize the truth in the quotation from Gill, a former minister of my own church, 'a man can never act as a pastor where he is not so much as a member'. The book ends with a quotation from the London Confession of 1677, appealing for 'that blessed Irenicum', which may well profit other Christians as well as Baptists.

E. H. ROBERTSON

The Catholic Apostolic Church, by P. E. Shaw. (Columbia University Press, via Oxford Press, 22s.)

To many of those who know Albury, Surrey, with its beautiful church and charming surroundings, and within a stone's-throw of the mysterious Silent Pool, it has doubtless occurred that they know remarkably little about the Catholic Apostolic Church, of which it is in some sort the cathedral. To them Dr. Shaw's volume will be welcome. Within moderate compass it gives an adequate account of the teaching, organization, and ritual of this little-known Christian society. It is well documented, and affords ample guidance for further study of the subject. While, however, we have read the volume with interest, we must add that the attitude and practice of the Catholic Apostolic Church make but small appeal to us. It lives in isolation and makes practically no appeal to an unregenerate world. 'Our word and our Ministry are to be addressed, not to the heathen, but to God's people; to the bishops, priests, and deacons of Christ's Church, to all that are baptized into Him, called to be saints.' These are the words of J. B. Cardale, a leading 'apostle', if not the founder, of the Catholic Apostolic Church. It is a Church which repels by its lack of sympathy, if not antagonism, to such evangelistic agencies as the Bible Society, Home and Foreign Missions, the Temperance Movement, and religious education. Surely it here fails in some of the first duties of the Church of Christ. There are numerous other points that invite attention, such as adventism and the symbolism of Church arrangements, order, and discipline. Of the relations of Irving with the Catholic Apostolic Church, which is sometimes called—or perhaps we should rather say mis-called—'Irvingite', we would fain have said something, if there were space. But this volume, more than any other, will meet the needs of those who desire further information about this small but very remarkable Church.

W. ERNEST BEET

Religious Cross-roads, by Radoslav A. Tsanoff. (Allen & Unwin, 15s.)

The title of this book hardly suggests its contents. It is an introduction to the philosophy of religion, though it is designed on broader lines than usual. After a brief introduction it proceeds with the question of the character and definition of

religion, and then with the consideration of primitive religion. A rather swift change to the issues of Biblical criticism follows. Next comes the relation of religion and morality from the factual rather than the critical standpoint. Illustrations are taken from non-Christian religions. Nature and the supernatural are next on the list, including Naturalism and the question of miracles. Then come four chapters on various aspects of the idea of God, and then such subjects as sin, salvation, atonement, religious conversion, prayer, mysticism, immortality, evil. The final chapters deal with the ideal of divine perfection and with modern thought and the Christian position. The whole is well documented and a good index is provided. It will be evident that Professor Tsanoff's book is of the omnibus variety, and, as it contains no more than 400 pages, it is comprehensive without being extensive. It should prove useful to students who desire to compass an examination syllabus in one book, for there is nothing else of which I am aware that covers so wide a ground in a single volume without sketchiness. Of course the treatment of certain points is bound to be rather one-sided. For example it is hardly correct to say that 'it is now believed by Chinese scholars' that 'Lao-Tszu' denotes a teaching, not a teacher, and that the author of Taoism lived in the fourth century B.C., for some competent authorities reject this altogether. On the other hand, there is no hint of the opinion that the traditional representations of Buddhism and Zoroastrianism are far removed from the original ideas of the founders of these religions. There are also some surprising omissions—the views of Otto, Barth, Brunner, De Sanctis, Alexander, and strangest of all, Aquinas. Whitehead is mentioned only in reference to his definition of religion. Professor Tsanoff does not lack the happy art of being able to treat pleasingly subjects which are too often treated heavily. He is well able to supply apt illustration and quotation. He can be sufficiently comprehensive without being diffuse. All this makes for easier reading. The treatment of disputed issues is judicial and obviously seeks to be fair. There is a welcome measure of definiteness in stating conclusions, and it is rightly recognized that religious sympathies, combined with a 'faith that inquires', form an indispensable condition of rightly estimating religious issues from the standpoint of philosophy. The volume is a useful handbook of religious philosophy, not merely in the stricter sense of the term, but also as a guide to the reader who, though unversed in philosophy, seeks knowledge of some of the problems presented by our religious belief and experience.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

God and the Jews, by Reginald Glanville. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

Frankly this book troubles me, though not, I think, in the sense in which Mr. Glanville would wish. It is an attempt to answer three questions: How can we account for the sufferings of the Jews? How can we account for their survival through centuries of such sufferings? By what means can we hope to bring these sufferings to an end? The attempt takes the form of what Mr. Glanville himself describes as 'a strictly Biblical argument, based upon Biblical premises and framed by a purely Biblical logic'. That at the outset made me a little uneasy. For one thing, I cannot help recalling the many other people who, with apparently quite sincere intentions, have used 'strictly Biblical arguments based upon Biblical premises and framed by a purely Biblical logic' to arrive at conclusions from which I suspect both Mr. Glanville and I would recoil. I feel that the approach is wrong in itself and that no attempt to deal with the problem of suffering of any kind in purely logical terms, whether the logic be Biblical or not (I should be interested to know what precisely is 'Biblical logic'), is likely to provide a really satisfactory answer. Mr. Glanville's method leads him to the conclusion that the service of the Jews to mankind 'has lain precisely in their suffering. For this service they were created and have been separated from men and dispersed amongst them. These are things which have

happened to them, not things which they have conceived and accomplished. Their service is in their suffering'. This, to my mind, if we are to be strictly logical, raises some very difficult questions with regard to the nature of God himself. I am sorry not to write more enthusiastically about a book which I know has been born out of a deep 'concern'. There is much in it for which I am grateful, and I hope it may stimulate further thought about issues that are of profound importance. But I cannot rid myself of the feeling that there is something rather unreal and in a way impersonal about its particular approach which, at the deepest level of its author's intentions, falls far short of providing a really satisfactory solution to the problem of the Jews. But Mr. Glanville believes that he has a message and it is right that he should deliver it.

WILLIAM W. SIMPSON

The Rebirth of the German Church, by Stuart Hermann; with an Introduction by Martin Niemöller. (S.C.M., 10s. 6d.)

Mr. Hermann ministered from 1936-42 to the American Lutheran Church in Berlin and was one of the first Oecumenical representatives who re-entered Germany after its breakdown, renewing old contacts and travelling all over the western zones, including Berlin. Thus he can speak with authority on the German Church situation as one who sees it both from outside and within and at the same time from above, i.e. *sub specie eternitatis*, as a true friend and brother in Christ who aims at constructive criticism. The vast subject is covered in ten chapters, of which Chapter 6: 'The Church repents and reforms' and Chapter 7: 'Laying new foundations', are the most important. One is amazed at the correctness of the whole vividly coloured picture and at the well-balanced statements. (Only in a few minor points does one find slight mistakes or is doubtful about some of the authorities quoted.) There is sound criticism of the way in which large parts of the Church reacted toward National Socialism, since it had more 'regard for the Church and its dignity than respect for human rights, let alone concern for the freedom of the Christian spirit'. We also need to think about another critical suggestion: 'Although some of these clear-sighted men saw through the Swastika from the beginning, it is regrettable that they never were able, chiefly for lack of time and resources, to set up a plan of battle as carefully conceived and executed as the one with which they had to contend.' Indeed, in a way we fought on too narrow a basis and failed consciously to develop the full implications in the political sphere. Only very few seriously considered 'conscientious objection' and many were and are proud that they fought unpolitically. The very careful study of the complicated question of guilt brings home to us that there are 'realities of the situation outside Germany which a discussion of German repentance must take into account, and of which only a few Germans are fully aware'. This is clearly demonstrated in the case of Thielecke *versus* Barth. 'There is something comprehensible but decidedly dangerous about the typically German conspiracy—in some quarters at least—to exaggerate Nazism's strange power over the people, and to endow Hitler with all sorts of mysterious attributes. Some of the most prominent Christian Thinkers have been prone to embroider the nation's Fascist lapse with fanciful allusions to demonic forces, which undoubtedly were present, but which unquestionably had their chief seat inside rather than outside the ordinary man.' Even 'Professor Heinrich Vogel of Berlin was still shaking his head last November over the *mysterium tremendum* of the Nazi antichrist'. There is a continual danger that 'oecumenical' visitors to Germany should be too ready to accept the German case as it is presented even by the acknowledged leaders of the Confessional Church, because they are either too little informed or too restrained in their expression of criticism. As Hermann escapes this danger, large parts of the

book, especially Chapters 4, 'Friends amid the foe', and 5, 'Onward, allied soldiers', and the chapters mentioned earlier, should be translated and read by the German public, for there is growing danger that people will not believe and accept many uncomfortable facts. At the same time the book is the best remedy for those Anglo-Saxon Christians who, under certain Roman Catholic and other influences, oversimplify the case in their criticism of Luther and also of Niemöller, not believing that he means what he says in his Message of Repentance before God and man (i.e. politically). It is the same with their criticism of the Church for its silence, for 'in actual fact the silence was not so profound as is sometimes assumed'. A certain weakness of the book is that the situation in the eastern parts of Germany is represented as it was at a certain crucial moment in the past. Many of the startling figures and facts are now out of date. One could say the situation has improved gradually in many ways in the eastern zone whereas it has declined in the western zones. The reader should bear this in mind when looking at Chapters 8, 'Between Hammer and Sickle', and 9, 'When Winter came'. 'In actual practice the position of the German Church, in the western zones at least, proved to be considerably better than it was under the Nazis' is also true about the eastern zone. The title of the book is perhaps too daring. Although 'rebirth' is the supreme need in a country and Churches where the ugly face of Nihilism lurks round every corner of our life both in the secular and (probably even more dangerously!) the religious sphere, it is possible to see signs of rebirth where they are wanting, and the writer does not altogether escape this danger. Anyone's 'veiled allusion to the German Church as a bulwark of a so-called Christian civilization against Bolshevism' misses the main point. A militant secularism is not to be beaten by any 'civilization' of a semi-Christian kind, but only by a genuine Christianity, and this can only come from hearing and obeying afresh the Command and Promise of the risen Christ. But this book is both very timely and very valuable.

RUDOLF WECKERLING

The Mind of the Modern University, by John Baillie; *The Christian in the Modern University*, by H. A. Hodges; *Christianity's Need for a Free University*, by A. R. Vidler; *The Place of a Faculty of Theology in the University of Today*, by Daniel T. Jenkins; *Religion in the University*, by David M. Paton; *Work and Vocation*, by W. G. Symons. (S.C.M. 1s. each.)

These six essays form part of a series of 'University Pamphlets' edited by Mr. Ronald H. Preston, Study Secretary of the Student Christian Movement. Most of the authors took part in a Commission of senior members of various English and Scottish Universities, which met during 1944 and 1945 'to consider the fundamental pre-suppositions of university education and their implications for the work of the S.C.M. in the post-war university'. While all the writers are Christians, 'they approach the Christian faith in different ways'. Professor John Baillie gives a characteristic diagnosis of the prevailing intellectual outlook in university circles today. Theology, once 'queen of the sciences', has had to yield up her sceptre, yet the 'independence' of the various branches of knowledge has proved beneficial, for through it knowledge has increased and Christian thinking has been challenged. But another consequence has been that the unified world-view has given place to an indefinitely continued suspense of judgement. Those persistent modern dogmas, belief in human progress and the all-sufficiency of purely 'scientific' knowledge, only show more clearly how prevalent and deep-rooted is the modern 'academic indifference to ultimate issues'. Professor Baillie demands far deeper thinking on fundamental questions and greater readiness on the part of individual teachers to acknowledge publicly their personal convictions. Professor Hodges takes up this

challenge, addressing himself confessedly to Christians—i.e. 'those whose ambition is to live as slaves of Christ, and to bring all their reading and writing, their research and lectures and tutorials, into subjection to the Incarnate Word'. This excellent pamphlet offers a frank and searching exposition of what it means to be, at one and the same time, a 'student' and a 'Christian'. Dr. Vidler argues that 'Christianity is something very different from the inculcation of the natural virtues, from moral idealism, from decency and goodwill, although Christians ought to be more devoted to these things than anyone else'. Mr. Jenkins claims for theology its right to a place, not only in the older universities (where vestiges of its traditional supremacy remain), but also in the modern 'secular' university, and urges that the study of theology must not be hampered by restrictions of its field, which would not be tolerated in respect of other university studies. 'The theologian is at least as entitled to a place in its life as the technician or antiquarian who generally dominates the place.' Mr. Paton's pamphlet, written (on his own confession) 'with vigour rather than with prudence', offers a comprehensive description of the various forms of organized religious life in universities today. Mr. Symons discusses the relation between 'work' and 'vocation' and, in protest against the heresy that 'Church work' is the only way of giving 'whole-time service to the Lord', pays a tribute to the witness of Methodist local preachers. These pamphlets deserve to be widely read; they should provoke thought and discussion.

W. F. FLEMINGTON

New Teaching for a New Age, by A. H. T. Glover. (Nelson, 15s.)

Granted that education is not a matter of memorizing words, but of activity and of appreciating situations and relationships, it follows that teaching ought to be planned with this in view. In Mr. Glover's secondary-modern school at Sheffield he experimented with ways and means to help a child to understand his environment, both social and historical, and so to develop intelligent and effective citizenship. To that end the children made models, painted pictures and charts, dressed dolls, and in short produced an exhibition to illustrate the development of English home life and its place in a more general history scheme, the development of a city, and the inter-relationships of the nations of the world. Mr. Glover gives the details of five such 'projects' as they were worked out by the pupils of the Junior Art Department of the Sheffield College of Arts and Crafts and which could be worked out equally well anywhere. 'Fascinating' is the right word to describe this activity, and not only did the children themselves find it so, but the many thousands of people who saw their work on exhibition outside Sheffield found it so as well. Mr. Glover has reproduced the pictures and charts in this book so that we can see for ourselves how it was all planned. If the teaching of religion were treated in a similar way, it would transform all our Scripture lessons in schools. And there is need for it to be done, for while Mr. Glover's plan exhibits in great detail such 'basic needs' as food, clothing, shelter, law, medicine, communications, education, and leisure, there is from first to last no mention of religion.

A. V. MURRAY

The Socialist Tradition—Moses to Lenin, by Alexander Gray. (Longmans, 21s.)

It would be a pity if any general reader were to be put off this book either by the title, the length, or the price. Whilst it is a book from which a specialist can profit and to which he can continually refer, it is by no means written in a dry-as-dust academic style. Sometimes indeed the author becomes almost cheap and unduly colloquial in style in his determination to place himself alongside the reader. It is, however, a major virtue of the book that so much sound learning and so many well-considered judgements are accessible in one comprehensive volume, and perhaps one ought not to cavil overmuch at the style. If the food is pre-digested, this only means it is the

more assimilable. The author's standpoint is admirable for his purpose. He is always concerned to analyse and discuss in a critical but constructive fashion, and whilst he belabours with gusto, he can appreciate with understanding. There are, however, certain drawbacks to an otherwise excellent book. Somebody is reported to have said to a famous savant: 'No one can possibly be as wise as you seem to be.' In the same vein it can be said that no one covering a field that stretches over thousands of years and covers many countries can hope to be equally competent in every part of his survey. The Jewish and early Christian traditions deserve more than thirty-three pages out of five hundred and fourteen. The author discusses the Old Testament without mentioning the major prophets! He even sums up the New Testament in five pages! There is no reference to the Epistle of James. Chaucer said of the lawyer that 'his studie was but litel on the Bible'. However much this writer has studied it, he shows little penetration in this chapter of his book. In his treatment of French political thinkers he has two particularly good sections on Louis Blanc and on Saint Simon and the fantastic Saint Simonians, but, if spirit as well as method be discussed, ought not something to be said about Chateaubriand and Montalembert, De Maistre and Lamennais? And what of French thinkers and writers in this present century? The author is noticeably strong in his treatment of scientific socialism, anarchism, syndicalism, and Guild socialism. He writes also a splendid chapter on Lenin. In these discussions the German thinkers on the whole are well and wisely appraised. But has Italy said nothing? Could not a paragraph be spared even for Mazzini? Surprisingly, the chief lacunæ are to be found in the author's extended treatment of his own country. Where so many little men are courteously treated in the chapter on early English socialism, could not some reference be made to Coleridge and Disraeli, to Carlyle, Dickens, and Charles Kingsley? It is surely grievous that in a book of this length no reference should be made to the pioneer work of the Christian Socialists. Again, while refusing to be tied down to a precise definition of socialism, Mr. Alexander Gray has introduced figures whose connexion with any of its forms seems casual and incidental. The introduction of many smaller men blurs the whole scheme of presentation. Indeed, the author would have done more had he attempted less. The book lacks coherent unity. When Mr. Gray attempts to draw his threads together, the effort is made too late. The connexion between historical periods ought to have been shown. We have a series of impressions rather than a history of Socialist thinking. But, having said all this, I still want to commend a book which tackles a pertinent and important theme with great ability and sustained enthusiasm.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

Leviathan, or the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil, by Thomas Hobbes. Edited with an Introduction by Michael Oakshott. (Blackwell, Oxford, 8s. 6d.)

What is the place of Hobbes's *Leviathan* in the long trail of political philosophy that stretches from Plato to Hegel and Marx? The question is of interest for two reasons. First, because what Professor John Laird called 'the device of government' must always be a subject of intense human concern and never more so than in the present juncture of history; second, because of the particularly provocative character of Hobbes's contribution to the age-long debate. This volume is the first in a new series of English political classics. Each is to be prefaced by an introductory essay by some modern expositor. If Mr. Michael Oakshott's introduction to *Leviathan*, with its sixty-six closely reasoned pages, is a sample, the standard of criticism and interpretation is to be high indeed. Hobbes seems to come on the scene almost like a bolt from the blue. Neither Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Dante, Aquinas, nor even

Machiavelli, had given so fully reasoned an account of the institution of government. Perhaps that is one reason why, as Mr. Oakeshott rightly observes, Hobbes has been so bitterly attacked, though not always with understanding. The outstanding distinction of the introduction is that it overcomes the misconception that Hobbes's philosophy was unrelated to any previous strain in the history of thought. He derives, in fact, from those late medieval schoolmen, the Nominalists, who denied the real existence of 'universals', and asserted that logic is only a matter of words and of correct deduction from definitions. Hobbes's predilection was for 'reasoning' in this sense, for the laying down of a definition and the drawing out of its consequences. Here is the key to the understanding of the *Leviathan*. It starts, as the First Part shows, not with the Commonwealth, but with Man himself. This is the sound approach. What is man that he should need government at all? Is the need for it inherent in human nature, as the Platonists affirm, or in some defect of human nature, such as sin, as Christian political thinkers like Augustine declare? Hobbes holds that the need for government lies in the peculiar make-up of human nature as he sees it. Through this each man seeks his own felicity and desires power and more power to achieve and safeguard it, which condition, if he be content to remain in it, brings him into constant enmity with his fellows. This is the human 'predicament' of perpetual war, according to Hobbes, from which government is needed to deliver us. So the institution of government rests on the surrender of the individual will to the sovereign will of the commonwealth, 'that great *Leviathan*, or rather, to speak more reverently, of that *mortal god*, to which we owe under the *immortal God*, our peace and defence'. 'It is a real unity of (all men)', he declares, 'in one and the same person, made by covenant of every man, in such a manner, as if every man should say to every man: I authorize and give up my right of governing myself, to this man, or to this assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy right to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner.' This account of the root cause of government fully justifies Mr. Oakeshott in aligning Hobbes with one of the three main patterns of political reflection in the history of European thought. The first derives government from Reason and Nature, and Plato's *Republic* is its representative. The third and most recent has *Rational Will* for its master-conception, with Hegel's *Philosophie des Rechts* to indicate its type. The second, whose roots are in Greece, Israel, and Islam, makes government depend on *Will and Artifice*, and has the *Leviathan* for its head and crown. Much more might be said, but it would run far beyond the limits of a brief review. The one extravagance in Mr. Oakeshott's estimate of the *Leviathan* is to describe it as 'the greatest, perhaps the sole, masterpiece of political philosophy written in the English language'. He rightly urges that it is not enough to read *about* the *Leviathan*, but that one should read the *Leviathan* itself. However violently one reacts to it, the effort to understand why one reacts is part of the discipline. Further, one should not confine oneself to Part Two, whose subject is, 'Of the Commonwealth'. Not only is Part One significant, but also Part Three, 'Of a Christian Commonwealth', if only to see why Hobbes believes that the public exercise of religion should be an affair of government. It was rank Erastianism, of course, but it helps to place Hobbes amid the swirl of political, ecclesiastical, and religious controversies of Jacobean and Commonwealth England.

E. C. URWIN

The Anatomy of Peace, by Emery Reves. (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.)

The Three Spheres of Society, by Charles Waterman. (Faber, 12s. 6d.)

The theme of the first of these books is the need for an organ of international sovereignty, about which both Mr. Bevin and Mr. Eden spoke not long ago. Mr. Reves demonstrates with hammer-blow logic, that the one and only alternative to

world war is world law. Argument upon argument leads to this conclusion. To speak of surrendering national sovereignty is wrong. There is no question of surrender; the problem is not negative but positive—it is that of creating something we have never had and imperatively need. War is the result of unregulated contact between power units, and the power units of today are the nation-states. But the nation-states are not strong enough, not sovereign enough, to protect the peoples against international war. Democratic sovereignty requires that local affairs should be handled by local government, national affairs by national government, and world affairs by international, world government. The seventy or eighty sovereign nation-states of today are so many separate sources of law, and the situation is identical with that of the period when feudal lords had absolute sovereign power in their own territories and fought and killed till kings imposed a higher sovereignty in a broader framework. Phrase after phrase drives out complacency and searches the conscience. Here are a few of Mr. Reves's contentions. Both capitalism and socialism and, in Russia, communism, are dominated by nationalism. The wholesale murder, torture, persecution, and oppression we are witnessing in the middle of the twentieth century proves the complete bankruptcy of Christianity as a civilizing force. The Christian Churches have deviated from their universal mission and have evolved into national organizations. We (socialists and capitalists alike) are moving straight toward totalitarian fascism; to a large extent we are already there. Full employment within the compartmented political structure of sovereign nation-states is either a myth or fascism. Collective security without collective sovereignty is meaningless. In the charter of the United Nations there is no provision for the creation of law to regulate the relations of the nations. Whether the use of force is an act of war or police action depends on whether or not the force is used without previously enacted law. Our salvation lies not in the wisdom of leaders but in the wisdom of laws.

Mr. Waterman's thesis is different, but he too believes in the imminent danger of totalitarianism in this country and elsewhere. Mr. Reves's book is wholly political and international. Mr. Waterman's is mainly concerned with home affairs. Each author sounds a loud tocsin and when Mr. Waterman turns to the international scene, he too recognizes the anarchic absolutism of the national sovereign State and asks what chance of peace there is while powerful States refuse to admit any law superior to their own interests and claim the right to act as final judges in their own causes. Mr. Waterman maintains that the problem begins to be soluble if a distinction is drawn between the State as a political organization and the nation as a spiritual organism. The force of this suggestion is derived from the philosophy of Rudolf Steiner with its doctrine of the three spheres of society—the economic, the political, and the cultural—but Mr. Waterman prefers 'spiritual' to 'cultural'. He expounds lucidly and with apt illustration a view of society which, in practice, would transform the functional ways of social life. The exposition begins in the realm of industry, with the theory of conditional ownership, the safeguarding of human rights, and the development of a self-managing economic life related to the community by other (? and better) means than State control. Mr. Waterman passes on to demand that the essential freedom of the spirit should be safeguarded, and to mark out the sphere and limits of governmental action. In each of the three political parties he sees a dominant native tendency which requires to be corrected by the native tendencies of the other two. His conclusion here is that there is need for a three-fold social order embracing all three parties if they are to remain in fruitful existence and not flake away until only one is left. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Waterman's 'three-fold' argument, it issues from an intense belief in human rights and the freedom of the spirit.

J. VERNON RADCLIFFE

Politics and Morals, by Benedetto Croce. Translated from the Italian by Salvatore J. Castiglione. (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.)

Benedetto Croce, who has done more than most to encourage a new mentality in his own country, still remains faithful to Italy's liberal tradition. He has been called the poet of philosophy. Such a title may make some who are politicians, and some who are moralists, rather impatient, but it indicates the loftiness of his conceptions and his general outlook. This book represents his liberalism both in religion and politics. In the latter realm he does not quote Goethe for nothing. In both domains he justifies his attitude, expounding and illustrating that faith which is the glory, or the shame—according to one's point of view—of those who still call themselves liberal, in general and in particular. Liberalism, says Croce, is a doctrine which coincides with a complete idea of the world and of reality. The liberal theory, in any context of thought, is 'centred in the idea of dialectics—that is, of development which, by means of the variety and conflict of the spiritual forces, continuously enriches and ennobles life and imprints upon it its unique and complete meaning'. Such liberalism is the enemy of authoritarianism. The latter, whether of the left or the right, is rigid, dogmatic, and mechanical. Liberalism opposes the artificial stabilization of antitheses which resist the fundamental ethical and moral processes of speculative thought and practical endeavour. Croce discusses, in this connexion, the tension between Church and State. He also discusses certain terms, such as '*bourgeoisie*' and 'free enterprise'. The former term he wishes to discard entirely, but the latter has become pitifully degenerate in the course of currency. It is significant to find our author quoting the expression of Hobhouse, 'liberal socialism', and expounding his own relation to it. The book is a most interesting study. To the British reader it may suggest that his average countryman is at least this kind of liberal, whatever his more practical affiliations may be. Indeed, in commending the book the reviewer recalls both the spirit and the achievement of a famous British statesman who is reputed to have called himself a liberal 'without prefix or affix'.

R. SCOTT FRAYN

These My Brethren, by R. G. Burnett. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

Mr. R. G. Burnett, who himself knows the work of the East London Mission in recent years, writes about it like the master of journalism that he is. He has the knack of describing a fine personality, whether it be that of the great Chudleigh, of whom he had personal knowledge, or, what is more difficult, that of Peter Thompson, the founder of the Mission, who belongs to the past. 'Peter', with his huge body and his W. G. Grace beard (I wonder if the East End nippers suspected a disguise), is portrayed with masterly skill. 'Incredible!' Mr. Burnett calls some of the stories about him, yet he makes them ring true, and true they were. The following extract from the first issue of Peter Thompson's *The East End* might have been written by Chudleigh, though I imagine the two men's politics were very different: 'Bitter and heart-breaking experiences soon bring the conviction that it is little use preaching sermons to people who are starving; or trying to save men who live in insanitary or overcrowded dwellings, and are the victims of the blood-sucking sweater and the spider-like publican. The haggard, dispirited look of the unemployed haunts one day after day, until it seems a mockery to talk of heaven to men who stand shivering with cold and hunger. The gospel for the hungry is bread, and the words come to his soul with all the force of a direct, divine command: "Give ye them to eat." ' 'Peter' goes on to say that it is even better to capture the thieves between Jerusalem and Jericho than to be a Good Samaritan. A very practical theology indeed! Thompson and Chudleigh were both great evangelists who both filled their halls by a practical sympathy that had neither 'side' nor patronage in it. But is that all? Is the East

End Mission just the story of two great men? Is the rest anti-climax? One of the values of Mr. Burnett's book is that he shows how Percy Ineson proved his worth as Chudleigh's successor, notably in the days of the blitz, and with how fine a spirit Ronald Bollom has taken up the work of the Mission in the hard days after the blitz. This is a fine book. Through Mr. Burnett's eyes we see the whole of the great story as it ought to be seen.

OWEN RATTENBURY

None Other Name, by Ian Macpherson. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

Advent to Easter, by P. Maryon-Wilson. (Christ Church Rectory, St. Leonards-on-Sea, 4s.)

Mr. Macpherson's book contains fourteen short sermons, some of them with such titles as, 'Jesus in the News!' and 'Singing the Genealogy'. A sermon on Jesus looking upon the Rich Young Man and loving him, is entitled, 'And Yet!' It begins with a story of John Wesley, 'that prior to preaching his sermons he would read them over to his washerwoman, cutting out every word she did not understand' (Did he?), and then expounds its theme under four heads—'So Near and Yet So Far', 'So Rich and Yet So Poor', 'So Good and Yet So Bad', 'So Wise and Yet So Foolish'. While the pages are full of what an old Scottish lawyer calls 'anecdotal', the writer's evangelical zeal is not to be overlooked. A little more care would have prevented such slips as a reference to a cobra's 'slimy' coils (which are perfectly dry), and Tyndale did not speak 'primitive Anglo-Saxon,' but fine Tudor English.

The Rector of Christ Church, St. Leonards, has printed Mr. Maryon-Wilson's twenty sermons. They keep closer to their texts than Mr. Macpherson's. Anglo-Catholic in tone, there is no doubt of their simple sincerity, even though St. Paul might be surprised at an exegesis of his words in 2 Corinthians 4¹⁰ ('always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body') as: 'We are to "come to Mass", to "hear Mass", to "assist at Mass" . . . and "live the Mass".'

HAROLD S. DARBY

The Wisdom of the Way, by Douglas W. Thompson. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

This is Theology as it ought to be written! The author was a prisoner-of-war for several years, first in Italian camps, then in German. Pressed by his fellow-prisoners, he began to lecture on the Christian Faith. Here are his admirable lecture notes. Written in language the common man can understand, they put the case for Christianity with compelling clarity. As Mr. Thompson says: 'The one thing the Christian Way is not is irrelevant, for it has either duped hundreds of millions of people down the centuries or billions of people have missed the full enjoyment of life by not accepting it.' Approaching his work with vigour, Mr. Thompson talks sense and faces the issues, whether he is stating the grounds for belief in God's existence, or weighing the evidence for and against the Virgin Birth. True, the argument is closely condensed, but the book remains eminently readable—quite the best 'Introduction to Theology' that I know. The chapters concerned with the historical Jesus are outstandingly good: only those concerned with the British Churches are poor. May one express the hope that the second edition will have a less childish dust-cover?

WILFRED WADE

The Christian Minister in India, by C. W. Ranson. (Lutterworth Press, 8s. 6d.)

How far have Christian denominations travelled along the road of co-operation? One good index is the training of their Ministries. It is significant of present trends in India, Burma, and Ceylon that in recent years all non-Roman bodies have had their attention focused, through the National Christian Council, on the common

problems of theological education—its linguistic aspects, its standards, and above all the total strategy required to provide their four million adherents with the right leadership and pastoral care. This book, Rev. C. W. Ranson's Report on this important subject, was issued in 1945 by the National Christian Council in India. After summarizing the history of the indigenous Ministry and its training, he surveys the needs of the Church, the existing systems of theological training, and the problems of recruitment. Then he propounds a far-reaching scheme for future development and for carrying inter-Church co-operation much farther, while providing for denominational emphases to be preserved within united institutions. He stresses particularly the need for new Theological Schools in each language area to give training of a high standard through the mother-tongue, and for the existing Colleges increasingly to pursue theological research, writing, and translation. The book is not dull, but gripping and full of interest. It is a notable tribute to the author's grasp of the subject, his skill as a writer, and the urgency of his zeal in a great cause. Very seldom indeed does the interest flag—only when insistence on a really important principle issues in some repetition. Mr. Ranson knows how to let humour break in so as to illuminate without distracting: he puts the tasks and needs of the Church in India into right historical perspective; and he ends on a high and challenging note. There are six valuable Appendixes. The book is well produced, in good clear type. The only addition I should desire, especially for readers outside India, is a map showing language areas and illustrating the strategy expounded in the text.

BASIL CLUTTERBUCK

The Christian Message to the Hindu, by A. G. Hogg. (S.C.M., 6s.)

This is a thought-provoking book on an urgent problem, and the writer brings to his task a life-time of intensive study of the life and thought of India. While granting the need for a sympathetic understanding of the Indian mind, Dr. Hogg recognizes that the challenge of the full Gospel must be so mediated as not to weaken it for the sake of accommodation to the thought of the country. He sees the fundamental contradiction between the values of life for the Indian Idealist and the Christian believer. The danger of syncretism is well brought out and the many sharp contrasts between the two systems of thought are carefully indicated. For instance, to the Hindu salvation means absorption and loss of individuality, while to the Christian it means sublimation and conservation of personal values. Again, in the problem of suffering the Christian answer is very different from that given in Indian thought. The writer rightly points out that the two systems of thought move on different axes. Reflective India seeks to escape from the temporal, while Christian thought speaks of a God of history. Again, the author shows how, through the centuries, Hinduism, with facile syncretism, has borrowed from other sources, made claims that are not justifiable from the old axioms of Indian thought, and is quite ready to give the same hospitality to ideas derived from Christianity. The Christian evangelist, therefore, needs to maintain the distinctiveness of the whole Christian Message and to refuse to yield to any process of accommodation that may damage the Message itself. This well-written book will repay careful study. It is specially to be commended to all who have to present the Gospel to the people of India.

PAUL RAMASESHAN

The Craft of Sermon Illustration, by W. E. Sangster. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

While the author's whole argument for the effective use of sermon illustrations is impressive, his first reason is the most cogent—they may make clear the divine message which the preacher is burning to proclaim and carry conviction to the minds of those who are not given to hard consecutive thinking. The argument

that 'a discriminating use of illustration is one means by which dullness can be banished from the pulpit' is perhaps less convincing. In discussing the Sources of Illustration, Dr. Sangster tells the preacher that he must have no truck with Encyclopaedias of Anecdotes, but must find his own illustrations. They crowd upon him every day if only he is alert to observe them. But 'the Bible is in a category all its own, not only as a Book, but as a source of sermon illustrations'. If preachers learn no more than this from this book, it will have justified itself. But the use of sermon illustrations is a hazardous business, and the writer is well aware of its perils. Of necessity, the book is littered with wise prohibitions to guide the feet of the unwary. Some examples may be given: Don't use illustrations as mere 'decorations'. The longer the illustration, the more sure you must be of its fitness and necessity (a glance at pp. 30, 49, and 60 suggests that even 'model' illustrations can be too long!). Beware of false analogies. As regards the special peril of 'personal experiences', the wise rule is quoted, 'Seven words about Him for every word about myself' (though most of us would suggest *seventy* rather than *seven*). Anecdotes are often too long, too sentimental, bizarre, inane, and dubious. If you cannot illustrate a point *well*, don't illustrate it at all. Be sparing in the use of quotations from prose and verse. Don't build your sermons round your illustrations. Don't use illustrations which need explanation. Don't be narrow in your range, or you will become a bore. Don't illustrate the obvious. Be honest, and don't embroider your anecdotes. Don't relate a story as happening to *you*, if it really happened to somebody else. And so on. To illustrate is as necessary as it is hazardous, and here is welcome aid from the pen of an acknowledged master of the 'Craft'.

GREVILLE P. LEWIS

The Changing Scene in China, by Gilbert Baker. (S.C.M., 6s.)

During the War many thousands of English people in our small island had to evacuate their homes, and Go West. But the English are a small, close-knit people. Not so the Chinese. Their trek was a trek of millions of people, over vast distances, and for eight or nine years. Their government, itself on the move, and constantly forced to think of attacks by the invaders, could help the population but little. Moreover, while the majority of our evacuees were women and children, in China even factories were removed piecemeal by their owners. Again, since one of the primary objectives of the invaders' attacks was the *intelligentsia*, these had either to remain in subservience, or to move, not once or twice, from one improvised habitat to another, under the stress of bombing. Mr. Baker's thought-provoking book is a study, from the Christian's point of view, of those who managed to come to a halt in Kunming, the capital of Yunnan province. There is a picture on the dust-jacket of a girl pulling one of those long, outsize wheelbarrows which were pulled in Shanghai by men, with sweat pouring off them. This girl is dragging other girls seated on her barrow, and her bowed forehead and unhealthy pallor can only recall the words 'He bowed His shoulder to bear'. The concentration of the intellectuals, young and old, in one city, provides Mr. Baker with a moving human scene. He has chosen Shakespeare's Seven Ages of Man as his method of picturing each section of these uprooted communities. He begins with the Youngsters (not forgetting their mothers). Then come the Students, who were encouraged to keep to their studies and not to join the armies, for, if Britain has a long social conscience, China has an even longer intellectual one. For the third group there are the Young Men and Women with their marriage problems. No longer can they be married off to the betrothed chosen by the family. I was glad to read that Mr. Baker speaks of shyness and reticence among the young women, for, in the first years of Emancipation, marriage was often a very temporary business, with much resultant heartache for the women. Next, the Soldier appears, with no Elizabethan swagger, but

too often an underfed, unpaid peasant, conscripted from his small homestead. Then the Official comes forward, surprisingly like the Chinese Civil Servant of many centuries: for did not China invent the Civil Service? Mr. Baker has written an enlightening chapter here on Chinese politics, showing us how Kuomintang venality puts, by contrast, the Communist in a good light—until we are faced with the latter's intolerance and ruthlessness. Then the stage changes to the Professor, lean, very lean perforce, and probably slipped because of the price of leather, but heroically keeping alight the torch of learning. Last there comes the final scene of Death and the coffin, which has always loomed so large in Chinese thought. Mr. Baker, whose sympathy is both deep and wide, has written a book that will stimulate the minds of all who have a vision of the Church Universal at work in this generation of displaced and replaced peoples, east and west.

DOROTHEA HOSIE

China Moulded by Confucius, by F. T. Cheng. (Stevens & Sons, 18s.)

The most impressive and attractive feature of this beautifully produced book is the frontispiece—the 'portrait of the Author'. His powerful, intellectual, pleasing and confident face is an epitome of all that his volume contains. Dr. Cheng is an 'impenitent Chinese', proud of his country and her great history and tradition. Few will question his main thesis that the China of history is the China of Confucius. Yet many would give a larger place to Taoism and a still greater place to Buddhism as effecting an incalculable influence upon the life of China. The chapters on religion, philosophy, family, marriage, and friendship are less valuable for their contents, as such, than for the fact that they are the clearly and beautifully written essays of a modern, much-travelled Chinese man of letters. Discarding all historical criticism of the classical texts, Dr. Cheng bases his statements upon the orthodox commentary, presumably, of Chu Fu Tse. This is as though a modern New Testament scholar should say: 'A plague on the critics and all their writings. Let us turn to the Gospels just as they stand.' Yet for the author's purpose there may be essential wisdom in such a course. Dr. Cheng appears to be mindful rather too much of the writings of foreign sinologues of fifty years ago. Is anybody much concerned with pre-revolutionary days, one wonders? The author's translation of fragments from *The Three Kingdoms* is particularly illuminating. Readers who wish for more of this most famous and popular of all China's stories will find it in an English translation of the *San Kuo, or Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, by C. H. Brewitt-Taylor. The Chinese are today, as ever, princes of story-telling. There are so many books about what we think of the Chinese that a book setting forth what a Chinese thinks himself has a value all its own. The entire truth is not likely to be found either in this view or in that; but unless men of the East and the West, in all friendliness and frankness, speak to each other face to face, how are we to know the truth as it should be known? As a contribution to this fuller knowledge, *China Moulded by Confucius* is greatly to be welcomed.

H. B. RATTENBURY

Caste in India, by J. H. Hutton. (Cambridge Press, 18s.)

Not the least splendid gift England bequeaths to India, as she withdraws, is the record of scientific, linguistic, and sociological research. Dr. Hutton, Professor of Social Anthropology at Cambridge, knows the vast literature about the amorphous, sprawling, hydra-headed monster called caste. He tries to get at the very bones of its anatomy. He explores its structure, strictures, sanctions, and functions. The classical Vedic theory of four castes with the Brahmin at the top never covered the facts and quite failed to explain the various 'exterior' castes. (Dr. Hutton avoids 'outcaste' because of its unfortunate confusion with 'outcast'.) The so-called Aryan invasion certainly did impose a social framework on the indigenous people, but the

most profound religious beliefs and taboos persisted, not only in areas not penetrated, but also in the souls, domestic habits, and rituals of those who were compelled to submit to Brahminical social control. The author therefore approaches the indefinable network called caste, not through the Sanscrit scriptures at the centre, but through surviving customs and beliefs of neglected populations in corners, hills, and forests. His own research among the Nagas detects survivals of wide-spread social conditions belonging to pre-Vedic India. He refuses to accept as adequate any single cause of caste. It is a phenomenon both complex and unique. The rules of caste incorporate surviving beliefs about the influence of different foods, the danger of pollution, the prospect of reincarnation, the demands of departed spirits, magic and heredity, and the privileges of religious agents. All these fermentations bubbled beneath racial and colour distinctions created by recurring southward invasions. Cutting across them all there is a profound division of two cultures based on patrilineal and matrilineal inheritance. Circumstances forced these clashing modes to struggle for survival side by side. In all parts of the world beliefs have clashed, but never have geographical conditions jammed together in isolation such varied types. It is a great, though common, mistake to suppose that Western contacts have destroyed the profound belief of most Indians that they are born into a society which has the right to impose the forms that every man's conduct and career shall take, and involve most of his duties to himself, his neighbour, and his god. What is probably the longest-lived social system the world has yet seen, has resulted from a social order which gave stability but was elastic enough to allow scope for political and religious changes and the survival, even, of primitive customs. The condition of European countries does not convince India that any Western system is superior or more stable. Though the Christian is confident that brotherhood in Christ must break down some of the walls of caste, it is not probable that they will fall like the walls of Jericho at a shout. The danger is that the Christian Church, faced with the problem of centuries, may again be content to become yet another tolerated caste. No new missionary could read this analysis and go to India imagining that the caste-system may soon fade away like some Western class distinctions, but his understanding and sympathy might from the beginning be greater than the hard-won experience of veterans of a former generation.

G. STANTON MARRIS

Land and Motherland, by G. T. Wrench. (Faber and Faber, 7s. 6d.)

Those who have read Dr. Wrench's earlier books will expect something here that is both arresting and provocative, and they will not be disappointed. He discusses the Indian Problem in the unusual setting of eighteen imaginary conversations, and advances views which all lovers of India will feel to be worthy of careful consideration. This is more emphatically the case with those arguments which are an amplification of Dr. Wrench's previous book, *Reconstruction by Way of the Soil*. Very valuable are the comparisons of the racial characteristics of Indians, British, Russians, Chinese. To see and understand these fundamental differences, in things both small and great, will make manifest the folly of imposing one people's pattern of life upon another. Thus, while the Englishman has developed a strong national civic sense, which is the background and inspiration of his representative government and has made him civically a very reliable man, 'the Indian, whether Hindu or otherwise, is not yet actuated by a civic sense but by a family, caste or communal sense'. Again, one cannot but appreciate the call back to the land. To attempt to reconstruct India without giving first consideration to the needs of its 700,000 villages and to the condition of the man of the soil, is inviting culpable failure of the first magnitude. But it is very much open to question whether the solution is to be found in an

innumerable number of small self-governing rural communities, self-contained and self-supporting. It is very doubtful whether they *could* be self-supporting, as Dr. Wrench's plan requires. Still more would many question the conclusion that Indian Native States are 'peculiarly favourable to a modern development of India, primarily based upon the land'. While Dr. Wrench believes that England has given India some great men, some giants, they all belong to the past, to the good old East India Company days! Surely his strictures upon the 'urbanized Government of India', the 'urbanized British Parliament', and the Statutory Commission, are a little less than fair. British rule has not all been a 'supreme blunder'. The impartial historian of the future will see something more than the dead hand of a foreign and unsympathetic power resting heavily upon India during the last one and a half centuries. In a book so wise and penetrating one would have expected that room would have been made for a recognition of some wisdom, some goodwill, some good work done by the English in official acts and in personal relationships. This, however, is a book which all real friends of India and its peoples should read and think about, even when they disagree, as they probably will, with some of the author's conclusions.

ARTHUR J. REVNELL

A Sussex Highway, by Ruth Cobb. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

A Sussex Highway tells, in pencil-drawings and prose, the story of a walk along the Sussex Downs from Lewes to Clayton, a land where every timber and stone is redolent of history and steeped in beauty. Miss Cobb knows the history and has a delicate eye for the beauty. Her book has many excellences. The publishers have achieved a fine piece of book-making, without a whiff of 'austerity', and the printing is a delight, some of the reproductions being near perfection. Doubtless the quality of the author's work inspired the craftsmen. I can imagine the sheer joy with which they handled the original drawings, for Miss Cobb has a charmed pencil. She can capture the spirit of the hills, the woods, the old timbered cottages, and the very atmosphere—not gem-clear, like the Flemish radiance, but blue and enchanted and flower-like—of lovely Sussex, a garden in a sea-girt isle. And she achieves this quality with a firmness and vigour of pencil-work in which every line is informed and eloquent. She can linger in rich detail or move swiftly in masterly suggestion, often blending the two manners to perfection. The figures with which she enlivens her scenes reveal her sensitive humanity. Again, she has a lively sense of history. A high-banked lane, a downland track, a tile, an oak beam, a windmill, or a cellar, will evoke tales of smugglers, horsemen, kings, Norman ladies, Roman road-builders, or dim shades of prehistoric swine-herds. In her company the winding path becomes a pageant of the centuries. It would be asking too much to expect Miss Cobb's pen to be equal to her pencil. Her prose would become firmer by a more severe use of the blue-pencil.

FRANK C. RAYNOR

Die Zeichen der Zeit, edited by Gerard Brennecke. (Versandbuchhandlung C. Ludwig Ungelenk, Dresden A.34, RM. 1.)

The new Evangelical monthly, *Die Zeichen der Zeit* ('The Signs of the Times'), launched in January of this year, is striking evidence of the rebirth experienced by the Church in Germany. Among the advisers of the Editor there are Bishops (as Dr. O. Dibelius), Professors (as Drs. Schniewind and Vogel), other Church leaders (like Hans Lilje), and Pastors (including one greatly loved and honoured by many friends in this country, Rudolf Weckerling). This list is a sufficient guarantee of the scholarship of the publication, of its Biblical basis, and of its relevance to today. The January number fulfils the Editor's hope that the words 'a royal priesthood' shall be the invisible superscription to every contribution. The Articles deal with

the inner life of the Church, including 'the cure of souls', the Church's witness in the world, and the thought of the world in which the Gospel is to be proclaimed. The Article of Gen. Supt. Dr. Krummacher on 'The Mission of the Church in the World' is especially noteworthy. There is no suggestion in this magazine of a Church drawing in upon itself, no suggestion of a restricted local or national interest. The Church Universal is the theme, but with particular reference to the present situation in Germany and to the Church in Russia. Reports on Synods and Church life are given, and Book Reviews are promised. It is not clear whether orders can be given from outside Germany, but it is greatly to be desired that English friends of the German Church should be able to obtain this very 'live' magazine.

PERCY SCOTT

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

Between Man and Man, by Martin Buber, translated by R. Gregor Smith. (Kegan Paul, 12s. 6d.)

In this volume Professor Buber includes five treatises that all bear upon his doctrine of Dialogism. Here, however, he deals directly, not with the fundamental relation between man and God, but with the derivative relation between man and man. He describes this, first, directly, under the title 'Dialogue'; then indirectly in a criticism of Kierkegaard named 'The Question to the Single One'; next, in two addresses on Education; and finally, in its philosophical setting under the question 'What is Man?' Professor Buber goes over the same ground again and again in different contexts, but this is all to the good, for his ruling idea needs repeated exposition if it is to be thoroughly assimilated. As might be expected, it is not at first easy to follow the thought of this exponent of a new philosophy. Professor Buber is an existentialist—that is, he believes that only 'happening' is truth—but he is an existentialist 'with a difference'. His chief criticism of Kierkegaard brings out his *differentia*. He believes that the great Danish thinker went astray just because he insisted that a man must isolate himself from others if he would really meet God. Hence he cut himself off from Regina Olsen. With Buber, on the other hand, true marriage is the best human instance of Dialogism. But many readers will learn most of his way of thought from the first and last of the five pamphlets (for none is longer than a pamphlet) gathered here. In the first there is an analysis of what happens when one man really 'meets' another man. It expounds 'fellowship', or to use Buber's word, 'community'. He insists that this is not merely psychological but 'ontic'—that is, it is something 'given' that exists as certainly as the 'I' and the 'thou'. It is no mere 'relation', but the basis of all personal relations. It does not exist between an 'I' and an 'it'—or between one man and another when either treats the other as an 'it'. It differs *per se* from the distinction between 'subject' and 'object'. It only occurs when, through the practice of 'responsibility'—a word used in the literal sense of 'the power to reply'—two men break through the barriers of 'individuality' and find that each is both himself and the other. It is not an experience though it is experienced. It does not necessarily mean agreement, for it may obtain between enemies. Indeed, it is implied in true hatred as well as in true love. When it occurs between man and man, it has limitations, but not when it occurs between man and God. Of course, these are no more than a few bald

and meagre hints of what Buber teaches. No satisfactory synopsis is possible. In the last pamphlet, on 'What is Man?', he traces the various philosophical answers to this question from Aristotle onward, giving his space chiefly to the period since Kant, and expounding and criticizing in most detail of all Heidegger and Scheler's recent theories. He is perhaps right in keeping to Germans in the period since Kant, but one would have expected something about Schleiermacher. His way of unifying the history of philosophy is to show how man is always seeking to make himself at home in a terrifying universe and so find security, but how, just when he thinks he has done so, the universe crashes in and destroys his painfully constructed home. For instance, Aristotle furnished such a safe system—but then Manicheism as exemplified in Augustine (why not Christianity as exemplified by Paul?) overthrew it. Or again, when Aquinas had supplied Dante with a 'closed system', through which the poet could safely find his way, the Renaissance demolished it. Professor Buber, like others, believes that today as never before, man finds himself insecure in his threatening universe, and must set himself to build a new home. Both individualism and communism have failed him, for neither does justice to the 'ontic' relation between man and man. Professor Buber is no pessimist, even today, for he is a Jew. He thinks, by the way, that, just because Jesus was a Jew, there are Jews that understand Him better than any Gentile can. There is no doubt that Dialogism is worth studying. It is a doctrine that seeks at last to do justice to the belief that fellowship between God and man is the foundation of true life, and this is the postulate of all religion.

In the Secret Place of the Most High, by A. J. Gossip. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.)

In this very welcome book Dr. Gossip sets out to help the ordinary Christian to pray, and the ordinary minister to 'lead in prayer'. He writes as if he were talking to a friend, and, as friends will, he does not hesitate to expatiate sometimes. Every preacher will envy his range and aptness in illustration. For instance, he tells us that when the pearls of the House of Austria lost their lustre, they were 'sunk for months in the sea from which they came'—and recovered it. 'O God, of good the unfathomed sea!' Another merit of the book is the multitude of quotations from the masters of prayer, including many Protestants. Catholic writings have too long almost monopolized the field. Dr. Gossip is too healthy a Christian to approve of the more extreme doctrines of the mystical writers. How could he when they claim to have passed beyond the need of Christ? He is the Master to whom his final appeal always lies. Our author, of course, is sometimes puzzled as others are, and frankly says so. His book has chapters on all the chief elements in prayer—except, some would say, 'relaxation'—but he gives the palm to Thanksgiving. Yet how searching his first rule of prayer is—'Do not lie to God.' The book leaves a reader asking himself, not 'How much time can I spare for prayer?', but 'How much time must I take for Prayer?' Dr. Gossip leaves no doubt that this 'pearl of great price' is worth its cost. His book is, in reality, a humble autobiography, and his readers will confidently walk hand in hand with him.

Salvation Symphony, by Guy H. King. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 5s.)

This loaf comes from the 'Keswick' oven, and, except at one point, it is good bread. I had better say first what the one point is. Mr. King holds the 'vicarious' theory of the Atonement in such an extreme form that he can believe that the phrase, 'Yet we did esteem him . . . smitten of God', tells the truth, and that God 'permitted the stroke of His wrath to fall upon His only begotten Son'—in brief, that 'God killed Him'. Mr. King quotes 'It pleased the Lord to bruise him' to sustain his interpretation, but does this phrase require any reference to 'wrath'?

Is there anything in the Servant Songs about wrath? It is strange, again, to find a writer taking the Hebrew word for 'make atonement', which may mean 'cover', to imply that till Christ died sins were only 'covered' up, not forgiven. But through nine-tenths of the book Mr. King carries me with him. He chose four chapters from the Bible for devotional addresses at Keswick—Isaiah 53, Ephesians 2, 1 Corinthians 13, and Romans 8—entitling them 'Foundation', 'Transformation', 'Demonstration', and 'Realization'—and he gives a kind of 'running commentary' on each, with many an apt illustration and many a pointed question. He by no means ignores the work of scholars. His method reminds one of Campbell Morgan's, but he is no mere copyist. He can gather the substance of a great Chapter under a few easily remembered 'headings' with great skill. For me, however, among many stepping-stones, there is one stumbling-block.

A New Fioretti, Early Stories about St. Francis, translated by John R. H. Moorman, (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.)

Dr. Moorman ends an excellent introduction to his book with the words: 'The stories . . . will round off and complete our collection of all that is known of the life of the Poverello.' There are seventy-five stories and, unlike those in the *Fioretti* itself, they are *all* about St. Francis. Dr. Moorman has been indefatigable in tracking them down. He always names the source of a story and the list is various indeed. Many come ultimately from Brother Leo, one of the last of Francis's friends to survive and a devoted 'Spiritual'. Of course no chronological arrangement is possible and Dr. Moorman skilfully collects the stories under subjects. The last has a sad interest of its own—'St. Francis and the Future of the Order.' He saw what was coming and could not stop it. Of course the authenticity of some of the stories here, as of some in the original *Fioretti*, would be hard to prove, but, apart from two Miracle Stories at any rate, there is nothing in them that challenges suspicion. For instance, would anyone have 'made up' a story to show that sometimes the birds would *not* listen to the saint's sermons? There is a pathetic account of Francis's joy when, by the help of the Pope, he was able to declare that on one day in the year any penitent who came to the *Protiuncula* would be forgiven '*all his sins*!' A child of his age here! St. Francis had other limitations that are not so easily explained—for instance, his distrust of learning—yet he is probably the greatest Christian for a millennium after Augustine, and we need to know all we can about him. Hardly any of these stories have been 'Englished' before, and we owe Dr. Moorman a real debt both for collecting, 'introducing', and translating them.

Milton and the English Mind, by F. E. Hutchinson. (Hodder & Stoughton, 5s.)

This book belongs to a series, edited by Dr. A. L. Rowse, in which each volume seeks to 'open up a significant historical theme' by way of the biography of a great man. Apparently the 'theme' here is the Englishman's love of liberty, but usually the writer assumes that the reader already knows the history behind the biography, whereas one would have expected a chapter on Puritanism. Again, there is little directly about 'the English Mind'. Mr. Hutchinson only compares Milton's mind with this undefined entity at two or three obvious points. The book is in reality just an able and competent introduction to Milton's life and writings. The author evidently knows all the ground, but it does not lie within his purpose, for instance, to describe the recent high debate about Milton. Rather unexpectedly, however, there are two chapters on the poet's theological heresies. Here, when Mr. Hutchinson refers to 'the creed', he might have told us which creed, and he should not suggest that the typical Hebrew Prophet had 'faith in the Chosen Race'. Love and faith are not the same. Again, Milton might quite consistently reject Greek philosophy while

using Greek literary forms and plundering Greek mythology, for one may 'spoil the Egyptians'. At the same time, is not Milton's appeal to 'reason' fundamentally Greek? But this is an excellent book for beginners. One of its merits is its apt quotations, both in prose and poetry, and it shows us Milton's way of life. For instance, in his old age he loved to smoke a pipe of an evening.

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

Dr. F. J. M. Stratton, Professor of Astrophysics at Cambridge, in his Essex Lecture, *An Approach to Truth* (Lindsey Press, 1s.), shows that scientists today, apart from 'the search for truth', can have 'no fixed creed', that all their discoveries are only imperfect approximations to truth, that there are other approximations—in aesthetics, ethics, and religion, and that there are 'certain deep truths present in all the world religions' which 'in their essence change less than does the scientific point of view'. He maintains too that scientists, like doctors, should 'pool' all their discoveries, but that, also like them, they should seek, always and only, the welfare of men. It appears that Professor Stratton has a fairly 'fixed creed' when he looks beyond science, though he does not integrate it for us. But in this lecture an eminent scientist gives us an honest and expert account of the limitations of science. . . . May Stoaate 'led the Devotions' at a Women's Fellowship School last autumn. In *Five Women* (Epworth Press, 6d.) we have her 'Orders of Service'. She doesn't do other 'leaders' high and difficult duty for them but—what is far better—helps them to do it for themselves. The 'women' are women in the Gospels. For once Martha gets a 'fair deal'. . . . There is now a 'Department of Criminal Science' at Cambridge and it is to have an 'Annual Lecture'. Lord Templewood gave the first, and it costs a penny a page—*Crime and Punishment* (Stevens & Sons, 2s. 6d.). A very 'clear majority' of criminals commit their first crime in youth. The lecture has many statistics, but the lecturer needs them to make out his case—that hope lies in 'training and after-care', of a better kind than we have yet discovered. He doesn't forget religion. . . . In *Living in the Window* (Epworth Press, 3s.), Derrick Cuthbert gives us twenty more 'little talks to children'. He shows again that he has a cunning eye for out-of-the-way things and a cunning tongue in telling about them. . . . *Making Christian Fellowship Real* is another of the Ecumenical Refugee Commission's poignant 'Occasional Papers' (21 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.1, 6d.). The Revs. Percy Ineson and Henry Carter describe the background of the thanksgivings of refugee after refugee.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, April (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 3d.).

Biblical Sacramental Theory, by W. Robinson.

Singular and Plural in St. Paul's Letters, by W. F. Lofthouse.

Principal T. M. Lindsay, by R. W. Stewart.

do., May.

The Unity of the New Testament—The Doctrine of Christ, by A. E. J. Rawlinson.

The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the New Testament, by H. G. Meecham.

The Wrath of God, by R. P. C. Hanson.

do., June.

The Unity of the New Testament: The Kerugma, by A. M. Hunter.

Evangelism and the Era of Atomic Power, by W. H. Rigg.

A Nineteenth-century Life of Christ (The Heliand), by R. G. Philip.

The Presbyterian, First Quarter, 1947 (J. Clarke & Co., 1s.).

The Situation of the Evangelical Churches in Germany, by W. A. Whitehouse.

The (German) Evangelical Church between East and West, by Rudolf Weckerling.

The Concept of Justice in the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, by Victor White.

The Presbyterian Church and its Future (in England), by Basil Hall.

The Hibbert Journal, April (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.).

Loisy's View of Christianity, by Hugh Brown.

Damnation for Unbelief as Integral Element in Christian Doctrine, by Perovsky-Petrovo-Solovovo.

Semantics, The Science of Mutual Understanding, by Richard North.

Paganism and Race Suicide, by G. F. McCleary.

On Teaching Doctrine, by J. Butterworth.

The Yale Review, Spring (Yale University Press, via Oxford Press, 3s.).

Places for Displaced Persons, by Alvin Johnson.

The Old and the New Diplomacy, by E. L. Woodward.

Cultural Handicaps in the North-west, by J. Kinsey Howard.

The Complex Problem of China, by Paul M. A. Linebarger.

The International Review of Missions, April (Oxford Press, 3s.).

Articles on the State of the Church in Korea (Kwan Sik Kim), China (W. Y. Chen), the Slav World (Paul B. Anderson), the Anglo-American World (Kenneth S. Latourette).

Articles on the Missionary Task in Palestine and Syria (W. M. Watt), Mexico and Central America (G. Báez-Camargo), India (Rajah B. Manikam), Africa south of the Sahara (Margaret Wrong).

'Functional' Social Anthropology and Missionary Method, by W. H. Newell.

Linguistic Research in the Church in Africa, by Lyndon Harries.

The Moslem World, April (Hartford Seminary, via Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 2s.).

Open Confession, by A. R. Stevenson.

A Visit to Chief Jusu (Liberia), by Joseph H. Beasom.

Some Relationships of Samaritanism with Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, by Eric F. F. Bishop.

Bell's Analysis of the Qur'an, by John E. Merrill.

Bibliotheca Sacra, January-March (Dallas Theological Seminary, Texas, 60 cents).

Pietism, by Miner Broadhead Stearns.

Typological Interpretation in the New Testament, by Charles T. Fritsch.

Harvard Theological Review, January 1947 (via Oxford Press, 3s.).

The Decalogue in Early Christianity, by Robert M. Grant.

Antiochene Exegesis in Western Europe during the Middle Ages, by M. L. W. Laistner.

The Problem of Human Self-Transcendence in the Dialectical Theology, by Harold B. Kuhn.

Zeus Peloris, by F. M. Heichelheim.

Journal of Theological Studies, January-April 1947 (Oxford Press, 5s.).

The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, by G. R. Beasley-Murray.

The Common Authorship of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles, by W. F. Howard.

Entry into Membership of the Early Church, by T. W. Manson.

Origen, Celsus, and the Stoa, by H. Chadwick.

The Revolt against Liberalism in Theology, by C. C. J. Webb.

Revue Biblique, Janvier 1947 (Paris, Librairie Victor Lecoffre, fr. 6.00).

Le rôle de la Tradition orale dans la transmission du texte de l'Ancien Testament, by R. P. J. Van der Ploeg.

Le Texte du Psaume XXXV et l'hypothèse de sa transcription primitive sur deux colonnes, by J. Magne.

Rabbi Aquiba ben Joseph sage et héros du Judaïsme, by R. P. B. Benoit.

Encore la troisième enceinte de Jérusalem, by R. P. L.-H. Vincent.

Theologische Zeitschrift, Januar/Februar 1947 (Basel, Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt A.G., fr. 4-50).

Die geschichtliche Bedeutung der jüdischen Gebetsrichtung, by Eric Peterson.

Die Vollkommenheitslehre des Clemens Alexandrinus in ihren geschichtlichen Zusammenhängen, by Walther Völker.

Luther und die Reformation in der schwedischen Theologie der Gegenwart, by Hjalmar Lindroth.

Zum Gedächtnis an Johannes Wendland, by Karl Barth.

Aural News is a quarterly journal that covers all subjects relating to the 'hard of hearing' (68, St. Margaret's Road, Twickenham, 2s. per annum).

Child Care is a new quarterly review, issued by 'The National Council of Associated Children's Homes'. Rev. J. W. Waterhouse is the editor (National Children's Home, Highbury Park, N.5, 4s. 6d. per annum, including postage).

vove

Slav

merica
rong).

ishop.

P. J.

es, by

ängen

droth.

68, St.

omes'

4s. 6d.